DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 476 447 HE 035 866

AUTHOR	Gordon, George; D'Andrea, Vaneeta; Gosling, David; Stefani, Lorraine
TITLE	Building Capacity for Change: Research on the Scholarship of Teaching. Report.
INSTITUTION	Higher Education Funding Council for England, Bristol.
PUB DATE	2003-02-00
NOTE	77p.; For the related case studies, see HE 035 859.
AVAILABLE FROM	Higher Education Funding Council for England, Northavon House, Coldharbour Lane, Bristol, BS16 1QD England. Tel: 0117-931-7317; Fax: 0117-931-7203; Web site: www.hefce.ac.uk.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrators; Case Studies; *College Faculty; Foreign Countries; *Higher Education; *Professional Development; *Scholarship; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	*England

ABSTRACT

The Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) commissioned a study of the range and depth of pedagogic developments associated with the scholarship of teaching in higher education. This evidence-based review was designed to explore the relationship between pedagogic development (PedD) as supported through the Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund and pedagogic research (PedR). The study was planned to take into account the role of various stakeholders, including higher education institutions, efforts funded by the HEFCE, and government agencies. The study began with a systematic literature review and added interviews with researchers in higher education and 5 key players in the field of scholarship of teaching, 8 case studies at higher education institutions, and an e-mail survey completed by 43 administrators and staff in higher education institutions. Findings show that most of those interviewed could articulate a working definition of PedD, although there was some confusion over the meaning of scholarship of teaching and how that concept related to PedD and PedR. The scholarship of teaching and learning was seen as overlapping with PedD and PedR, and considerable activity in these fields was identified. Respondents were generally optimistic about the possibilities of advancing PedD. The case studies reveal significant levels of supportive activity within that sample of institutions. (Contains 115 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 476 447

Building capacity for change: research on the scholarship of teaching

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R Kyle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Report to HEFCE by
George Gordon, Vaneeta D'Andrea, David Gosling, Lorraine Stefani

February 2003

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE035880

Contents

		page
Chapter 1	Introduction and scoping of the review	2
Chapter 2	Highlights from the literature review	12
Chapter 3	Promoting and supporting effective staff development	27
Chapter 4	E-mail questionnaire based survey	38
Chapter 5	Interviews with key stakeholders	48
Chapter 6	Summary and suggestions for capacity building	60
Appendix 1	Bibliography	67
Appendix 2	List of abbreviations	75

Case studies (on the web with this document at www.hefce.ac.uk under 'Publications/R&D reports')

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge:

- The generosity of interviewees and respondents, all of whom spared precious time to contribute to the Review. Some respondents also sent copies of articles and book chapters and drew our attention to other sources of information, and we benefited from this support and guidance
- The authors of the case-studies which enrich this review:
    - Vaneeta D'Andrea, City University, London, & University of Surrey, Roehampton
    - David Jenkins and Glynis Cousin, Coventry University
    - Ray Land and Dai Hounsell, University of Edinburgh
    - David Gosling, University of East London
    - Suzanne Shale, University of Oxford
    - Lorraine Stefani, University of Strathclyde
- Our colleagues at the University of Strathclyde, City University, London, and the University of East London who contributed directly to the research and who gave invaluable advice
- Secretarial staff especially at Strathclyde who undertook this additional burden and greatly enhanced the layout and production of the report
- The support and encouragement provided by Sarah Howls, the Project Manager for HEFCE.

Chapter 1 Introduction and scoping of the review

1.1 The Review was undertaken jointly by Professor George Gordon and Dr Lorraine Stefani (University of Strathclyde), and Critical Change Consultants for Higher Education which is the trading consultancy name used by Professor Vaneeta D'Andrea (City University) and Dr David Gosling (University of East London).

1.2 The invitation to tender indicated that HEFCE sought to commission a review of the range and depth of pedagogic developments associated with the scholarship of teaching in higher education. The review was to be evidence-based and was expected to explore the relationship between pedagogic development (PedD) as supported through the various strands of the Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund (TQEF) and pedagogic research (PedR) as supported through the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) and the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) Teaching and Learning Research Programme. The Review was also expected to indicate how HEFCE, in collaboration with other partners, could best support the relationship between PedD and PedR.

1.3 The invitation to tender specified that the review should aim to achieve the following:

(a) Identify what processes are currently available which allow academic staff to engage with PedD.

(b) Identify any mechanisms within these processes by which academic staff can progress from PedD to PedR.

(c) Identify any gaps within current provision of academic staff development with regard to PedD.

(d) Recommend processes by which any such gaps could be addressed.

(e) Identify what action should be taken, to support and promote scholarship.

(f) Identify areas of good practice, such as examples of staff development policies that encourage an integrated approach to the development of the teacher/researcher in higher education, and support the scholarship of teaching.

1.4 The review was charged with taking into account the role of the following stakeholders:

- Higher Education Institutions
- HEFCE funded National Co-ordination Teams (TQEF NCT, Action on Access and the National Disability Team) and programmes (e.g. Learning and Teaching Support Network (LTSN)) including National Teaching Fellowship Holders (NTFs)

- Representative bodies and stakeholders including the other UK funding bodies, Research Councils, Universities UK (UUK), the Standing Conference of Principals (SCOP), Institute for Learning and Teaching (ILT), Teaching Unions, staff training and development bodies (e.g. SEDA and HESDA), the Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) and the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA).

1.5 In the tender proposal, we outlined the following key objectives for the formative evaluation as:

- To determine the understandings within and across the higher education sector of the links between PedD and PedR
- To assess the current processes available for academic staff in higher education to engage in PedD, at local and national level
- To determine if programmes to support the scholarship of teaching have been evaluated, and if so what the results suggest
- To determine what programmes are currently supporting the scholarship of teaching at institutional, national and international levels
- To determine the level of priority which is given by key stakeholders to PedD and the level of parity with traditional research and development
- To identify institutional programmes of best practice in supporting the scholarship of teaching.

Methodology

1.6 The methodology sought triangulation of evidence from the following sources:

- A systematic review of the literature on the scholarship of teaching and learning – including views from working groups (such as those on PedR and on research and teaching), policy statements, conference proceedings, journal articles and web-sites.
- A series of case-studies of practice drawn from a sample of pre- and post-1992 institutions.
- Structured interviews with key individuals in higher education institutions (HEIs), and the key stakeholders specified in the invitation to tender.

1.7 The literature review and interviews with active researchers in higher education sought to explore definitions, identify the range of topics researched, make international comparisons, identify both barriers and limitations and examples and indicators of successful practice.

1.8 The case-studies were designed to add illustrative depth to the evidence-based review.

1.9 The broad raft of interviews sought to explore definitions and understandings of PedR, PedD and scholarship of teaching and learning; identify the range of views and experiences of practice, successes, limitations and barriers; and establish evidence on priorities and ways of interpreting and addressing the issue of parity.

Operation of the review

1.10 Professor D'Andrea and Dr Gosling oversaw the literature review. Dr Stefani managed an e-mail survey of all HEIs with the e-mail survey questions (Figure 1) also being used in the interviews with key stakeholders and other interested parties.

1.11 The questionnaires deliberately commenced by asking respondents to define the key terms. We know from the telephone and face-to-face interviews that this was a valuable opportunity for respondents to clarify their thoughts and articulate their perspectives, which was the intention in starting with these questions.

1.12 Generally several attempts were made to contact key stakeholders by telephone. Despite this level of application it proved impossible to contact some individuals or to agree a mutually convenient slot for an interview. In the latter case individuals were invited to submit an electronic return and some did so. In the event only a small sample of National Teaching Fellows were interviewed and it was not possible to conduct interviews with QAA, Action on Access, SCOP, HESDA, SRHE, AUT or the funding body for Northern Ireland.

1.13 The period during which the survey was undertaken added a further complication. The nearness of the end of term and the approaching Easter vacation doubtless coincided with a particularly busy period for many people. In all of these circumstances, we were pleased with the volume of responses.

Definition of terms: pedagogical development and pedagogical research

1.14 We were invited to explore the relationship between pedagogic development (PedD) as supported through the various strands of the TQEF, and pedagogic research (PedR) as supported through the RAE and the ESRC Teaching and Learning Research Programme. As our research data indicates, many practitioners have limited familiarity with the terms PedD and PedR. Indeed, a few question the validity or usefulness of the terms. However, the majority of the respondents were able to articulate broad distinctions between the two concepts and these are explored in later Chapters.

Whilst the concept of the scholarship of teaching has been used quite widely for over a decade, triggered in large measure by the initial work by the American educator Ernest Boyer (1990), that has not resulted in universally-shared understandings within the wider academic community, even in the USA. More commonly used words are "educational" or "academic" or "learning and teaching" development (for PedD); and PedR is commonly seen as a sub-set of research in education (more particularly higher education). In order to explore the distinctions and relationships between these terms we will need to engage in an exercise of "stipulative" rather than "descriptive" definition.

Figure 1. E-mail survey questions derived from an articulation of the points made in paragraph 1.7, and in our tender proposal.

Question 1	What is your understanding of pedagogical development? What activities does it include? What is your understanding of pedagogical research? What activities does it include? What is your understanding of the scholarship of teaching and learning? What does it include?
Question 2	Are you aware of opportunities available to academic staff to engage with PedD? What can you tell me about these opportunities and how they are taken up?
Question 3	What gaps (if any) do you perceive in the professional development available to academic staff which impacts on PedD?
Question 4	What relationship between PedD and PedR would you favour? How does that compare with practice in your institution (organisation) and across the sector?
Question 5	What staff development policies and strategies encourage integration between teaching and research and support the scholarship of teaching? Can you give examples?
Question 6	Are you aware of any evaluation of such strategies? If so, what had been the results of these evaluations?
Question 7	How would you describe the quality and impact of the current state of the scholarship of teaching?
Question 8	How important is it for academic staff to research their own teaching?
Question 9	Should such research receive parity of funding with other kinds of research?
Question 10	What is the impact of the current funding regime on building capacity for the scholarship of teaching and learning?

1.15 The first point to make is that PedD and PedR have a common focus or content. This focus/content is the relationship between teaching, learning and the learner and subject matter, within the context of higher education. It may be helpful to offer some clarification of each of these terms:

- "Teaching" is understood broadly to include factors impacting on teachers in HE methods of delivery and supporting learning
- "Learning and the learner" is understood to include any process of acquiring knowledge and understanding, skills and capabilities, feelings, attitudes and values, whether consciously or unconsciously acquired, and influences which impact on learning and the learners or students and their characteristics
- "Subject" means whatever is being learned (learning outcomes), including the curriculum and how it is organised and presented to students (course design), how subject content is assessed, and the nature and structure of knowledge
- "Higher education" includes policy matters and their impact on teaching and learning, social structures of institutions and their history, technologies, infrastructure and management.

1.16 Secondly, these terms, PedD and PedR, do not refer to entirely distinct and clearly demarcated areas of practice or discourse. On the contrary they denote overlapping sets of activities. Both terms can refer to activities, or to the outputs which derive from these activities. There is a considerable overlap between the activities and the outputs. Figure 2 suggests examples of activities and outputs that might be part of either PedD or PedR.

Figure 2 Activities and outputs common to PedD and PedR

Activities	Outputs
Observing, investigating, evaluating, designing, reflecting, writing, facilitating discussion, discussing, advising, describing, analysing...	Texts – papers, books, reports. Web-sites and other forms of electronic communication. Guidance on good practice. Changes to practice

1.17 The common focus and the overlapping activities and outputs form the "broad canopy" of scholarship of teaching to which Mary Huber has referred:

I have always seen the scholarship of teaching and learning as a broad canopy, under which a wide range of work could thrive. This could include work of the kind Schoenfeld and his educational research colleagues do, the work most Carnegie Scholars are doing when they make inquiries into their classroom practice, document their work, and make it available to peers in relatively informal settings." (Huber in Hutchings, 2000: 9)

This quote implicitly refers to a spectrum ranging from formal "research" through to informal "development" activities, but we contend that PedD and PedR do not form a single continuum. However, as we shall see below there are some discernible differences in the ways in which "development" activities are distinguished from "research" activities, which enable a distinction to be made between these terms.

1.18 We suggest that the terms may be used to denote different features of enquiry within the broader field of the scholarship of teaching and learning. PedD and PedR represent different characteristics, or different emphases, within what we call "dimensions of enquiry" which we discuss below. This is not intended to be a definitive list, since neither PedD nor PedR are sufficiently precise terms for us to say what each must always include or exclude. We might appeal to the notion of "ideal types" to help clarify the differences, without implying that the reality of activities ever simply matches the "ideal types" sketched here.

Whilst recognising the danger in creating a false dichotomy between these terms, we nevertheless attempt to summarise the differences captured by the "ideal types" of PedD and PedR in Figure 3.

Dimensions of enquiry

1.19 The following is an attempt to capture the "dimensions of enquiry" which may be used to explore the similarities and differences between development and research in the context of higher education pedagogy.

1. Formality of enquiry

PedD includes informal activities, such as conversations, mentoring, giving feedback, discussions and more structured forms of informal enquiry such as "learning sets", "teaching circles", and workshops, as well as clearly structured projects investigating and evaluating aspects of teaching, learning and the subject. PedR, on the other hand, will normally be expected to meet the formal requirements of the research methodologies employed (see dimension 8 below), although more informal activities may be used to support the research, such as research seminars and research supervision.

2. Communication/audience

PedD may remain within the private domain of individual lecturers reflecting on their teaching through a personal diary or log, or be relatively restricted within departments, faculty or institution. PedD often becomes public through a variety of outlets, ranging from reports to departments through to fully peer reviewed publications aimed at a national or international audience. Increasingly web-sites are being used to make PedD available in the public domain. PedR is more likely to be aimed at a wider audience ultimately for publication (for example to meet RAE requirements) within peer-review

journals or texts. Private or restricted communication, confined to a small group of colleagues, is also common especially in the early stages of PedR.

3. Scope of the inquiry

The scope of enquiry is determined by the nature of the question being addressed and does not easily distinguish between PedD and PedR. Enquiries undertaken as PedD or PedR can have a relatively narrow focus, for example the experience of a lecturer within a specific discipline, or some sub-set of that experience, such as the application of an assessment method. PedD may be more heavily contextualised by the location in which it occurs than PedR, which aspires to have a broader impact. But this is not necessarily the case, since some PedD aspires to draw conclusions which are generic.

Where PedR is based on experiential evidence, the scope may also be quite narrow; but PedR may also be broader in its scope, for example by researching across institutions within a nation or may be a comparative international study.

4. General applicability

The general applicability of the conclusions will reflect a variety of factors - the methodology employed, the scope of the enquiry, the size of the data set and so on. Much of the PedD literature seeks to provide normative guidelines on "good practice" which aspires to have wide general application. The evidence base for such generalisations is sometimes the author(s) experience as a teacher and/or educational developer, or systematic enquiry and analysis. Not all PedR seeks to achieve wide application, but where large scale empirical studies do attempt to reach general conclusions they fall clearly within the domain of PedR.

5. Subject orientation

Both PedD and PedR activities/outputs can range across this dimension. Either may focus on some aspect of the pedagogy of a subject or discipline, or have wider applicability across interdisciplinary studies or cognate subject areas such as the humanities or sciences. Equally, either may have generic application.

6. Methodological orientation

PedR can employ the whole range of methodologies of research methods - narratives and ethnography, phenomenography, case studies, empirical and quantitative research. PedD is less likely to be conducted using fully developed research methodologies, but such activities may be influenced by and reflect methodological approaches in PedR.

7. Level of theorisation

Much of PedD does not seek to be highly theorised because it is focused on application to professional practice rather than using traditional academic processes. PedD tends to describe or analyse teaching and learning without reference to underpinning research-based theories. It tends to be more eclectic and pragmatic. Its raison d'etre is to explore ways of improving student learning in a way which communicates directly to lecturers at all levels and across all disciplines. This means that PedD generally avoids the complexities (and potential obfuscation) of theoretical discussion which is appropriate to PedR.

8. Application

PedD is a strongly applied area of activity, where the outcomes of the activities undertaken and reported are intended to have direct practical usefulness to teachers and learners, and sometimes policy makers and managers. The relationship of PedR to practice, in the short-term at least, will be more complex and less direct. Conceptual and empirical research in PedR may be exploring our understanding of aspects of learning and teaching without necessarily attempting to influence practice in an immediate way. This means that PedD is often more prescriptive than PedR. PedD is more likely than PedR to have as its output guidelines for good practice, or simply a different way of engaging in a practice such as lecturing, acquiring student feedback, assessing students. PedR may simply provide a more complete or more informed description or analysis of a practice, but not necessarily lead to a change in that practice.

9. Engagement with communities of practice

The degree to which staff undertaking enquiries become critically engaged with wider communities of practice and discourse varies within both PedD and PedR. It has been suggested that engagement of this kind is a critical feature of adopting a scholarly approach. Individual staff seeking to develop their teaching may not systematically engage with others similarly engaged. However, increasingly through learning and teaching or educational development centres, LTSN subject centres and through conferences, more academic staff are engaging in debate with others pursuing similar lines of enquiry. The community of practice for a given lecturer undertaking PedD might be other academics from within a single discipline or across all disciplines. For example, it might be all staff using a similar form of pedagogy (such as work-based learning), similar methods of delivery (such as e-learning), in a similar context (e.g. outreach teaching), or tackling similar problems (large classes).

Most PedR generally takes place within, and is informed by, a research community which is defined by discipline networks, journals and other publications, and academic conferences. Since PedR straddles across several so-called "disciplines" the relevant community of practice may be within or across traditional academic departments.

10. Degree of cumulative knowledge

PedD tends to increase understanding through an accumulation of experience. The opportunity to achieve cumulative knowledge in PedD may be limited by the relative isolation of the staff, the extent of the literature search undertaken and lack of theorisation. PedR is better able to achieve cumulative knowledge, at least within certain research paradigms (not all research methodologies accept that accumulation of knowledge is possible), through having a stronger theoretical base founded on thorough literature research and larger empirical data sets. In this way, some accumulation of evidence in support of knowledge claims can be achieved through PedR.

1.20 We have sought to emphasise that PedD and PedR are overlapping not distinct practices, but, to summarise the discussion above, we can construct two "ideal types" (see Figure 3) which represent, in a simplified form, the different emphases of the two terms.

Figure 3 A representation PedD and PedR "ideal types"

	Ped D	**Ped R**
activity	aim to improve practice	aim to describe, analyse, conceptualise
	informal methodology	formal research proposal
	context specific	applicable to wider contexts
	own teaching/own department	independent of own teaching
	aimed at local audience	aimed at national/international audience
	pragmatic, low theorisation	based on established theory
	subject focused or generic	subject focused or generic
outputs	improvement to practice	better understanding of practice
	limited general applicability	generally applicable output
	non-refereed publication	peer reviewed publication
	guidelines on good practice	analytic description/ conceptualisation
	for own institution use	results in the public domain
	web-site	may be reported on web-site
	publication	publication

1.21 The remainder of this report distils the evidence which was collected in the Review, integrating into it a revised version of an initial mapping study of current activities. Chapter 2 presents the principal messages from the literature review. Chapter 3 discusses initiatives to promote and support effective professional development, PedD and PedR, in higher education. Chapter 4 analyses the e-mail questionnaire survey, while Chapter 5 concentrates upon the interviews with key stakeholders. The case studies are presented in a separate document, available with this report on the HEFCE web-site www.hefce.ac.uk under 'Publications/R&D reports'. The main findings are summarised in Chapter 6, which concludes with suggestions for capacity building. Appendices give the bibliography and a list of abbreviations used in the report.

Chapter 2 Highlights from the literature review

Scholarship of teaching: selective literature review

The nature of academic work

2.1 Underlying much of the debate about scholarship of teaching are different and competing conceptions of academic work. In the UK the debate has been primarily about the relative importance to be attached to research and teaching, whereas in the USA there has been a threefold division - *"Academic work has been defined as teaching, research and service"* (Kreber, 2000). Service includes internal work on committees, course administration, university working groups as well as external contributions to the community. In Britain there has been increasing concern over the erosion of time for scholarship as a result of the impact of administrative work as well as of worsening staff student ratios. The debate is a highly charged and political one because of the impact it has on the career opportunities of academics. In the USA the debate has been driven by concerns over tenure and promotion, whereas in Britain the focus is on promotion and recognition. In both cases there is also a more general issue about the impact on the quality of the student experience and what it is that academics are being held accountable for.

2.2 Consistently, the issue related to the competing demands on the academic is the differential value given to each of these roles. Because the research role is the traditional conception of what academics do (Rice, 1992; Elton, 1992, 2000, 2001; Daly, 1994; Jenkins, 2000b), it is most often seen as having greater value and higher status. This conception emphasises the products of academic research – published papers, reports, and presentations. The outcomes of teaching (and also in the US, "service"), have not been as clearly understood or publicly valued. The relationship between the two or three primary components of academic work also remains highly contentious.

2.3 The debate has tended to polarise between those who argue that research is an essential underpinning for teaching (Jensen, 1988; Millar, 1991; Johnston, 1996; Cooke, 1998) and those who argue that research, as traditionally conceived, leads to the neglect of teaching (Boyer, 1990; Rice, 1992; Daly, 1994; McNay, 1999). Much of the literature supporting the former position is substantiated not so much by research evidence of the link, but by research into academics' perceptions of the link (Neumann, 1992; Robertson, 1999), as Elton, 2001 has pointed out.

This polarisation has led to an enormous discussion about the relationship between research and teaching (e.g. Elton, 1992; Hattie and Marsh, 1996; Jenkins et al, 1998 and 2000). Some argue that the teaching-research relationship, as traditionally conceived, is only realised in small pockets of the university sector (Ben-David, 1977; Moses, 1990; Daly, 1994). Brew and Boud (1995) have argued that in fact it is not research and teaching relationship that are linked, but rather that both are connected with the "act of learning".

2.4 In addition to the debate about what is valued in the academic role, are the views of staff about what they actually do or prefer to do in their role. Moses (1990) has shown how different subject areas have different views about the relative importance of teaching and research. In the USA, research undertaken by the Carnegie Foundation showed that 60 per cent of faculty would rather teach than do research, and 70 per cent agreed that there should be better ways, beside publications, to measure faculty performance (Boyer, 1994). Kreber's (2000) recent work in Canada has provided a more fully delineated role analysis. She has identified 17 aspects of academic work. Using Kelly's Repertory Grid technique, she found that it was possible to cluster the way academics describe their work into five factors: interaction/scholarship, teaching/with some aspects of citizenship, extramural activities, academic work routines, and product research. She concludes that *"the tasks associated with teaching are seen to be very different from the activities of conducting research".*

2.5 The difficulties in resolving this debate have led others to argue that it is based on a false dichotomy between research and teaching, and that a new definition of scholarship would be helpful in breaking down the polarised positions adopted on the research and teaching/learning debate. The work of Ernest Boyer (1990) in "Scholarship Reconsidered" is generally taken as being an important turning point in widening the debate about the place of "scholarship of teaching" as opposed to traditional notions of research which he terms "scholarship of discovery".

2.6 In the next section we focus first on the research/teaching link and follow this with a discussion of the debate on scholarship, before focusing on scholarship of teaching and PedR. We conclude by considering the literature on the impact of the RAE and some general points on capacity building in these areas. In this selective review of the literature we have not undertaken an analysis of the vast range of work that could be included under the heading of pedagogical or educational development. We have taken the view that it is primarily the idea of "scholarship of teaching" which is the focus of this study.

<u>The research/teaching link</u>

2.7 Jenkins (2000b) has undertaken a masterful survey of the evidence on the relationship between research and teaching. It is impossible to do justice to the huge literature which he considers. His conclusions are that the "conventional" view as stated by Cooke (1998) and Johnston (1996) of the "*close interdependence at the level of the individual academic is not supported by the research evidence, while even at the level of the academic department it is not self evident. However, nor does the evidence support the 'no functional relationship' view.*"

2.8 The Ramsden and Moses (1992) study of Australian universities analysed faculty research and teaching effectiveness across a large number of institutions. The conclusion was that typically "*no relation or a negative relation between teaching and research exists at the level of the individual or*

at the level of the department across all subject areas". Kreber's (2000) view is that those who have argued that a relationship exists are more concerned with the processes underlying both research and teaching, rather than attempting to find correlations between outputs (for example Hattie and Marsh, 1996). An example of this would be Rowland (1996) who found that all the heads of departments he interviewed expressed the view that active involvement in the research process directly improved the quality of teaching. He argues that enquiry underpins both research and teaching (Rowland 2000). Jenkins (2000b) argues that the possibility of research influencing teaching is significantly increased where "*effective linkages are purposefully created".*

2.9 Linkages can be achieved when (a) course design creates ways to build on staff research, and (b) the methods of teaching and learning employed include involving students in investigation and enquiry based activities. Brew (2000) has argued along these lines, "*If researchers recognise the ways in which their activities parallel those of students and take steps to involve students in research-like activities, research can inform practice in facilitating learning".* Barnett (2000) also argued that lecturers need "*to foster student experiences that mirror their experience as researchers".* The link between research and teaching being suggested by Barnett and Brew is between the methods of researching and the methods of teaching. The possibility of the content of research influencing teaching is less clear and will vary from one discipline to another. Two studies, one in Australia by Moses, 1990, and one US study by Colbeck, 1998, found that the link between research by English scholars and their teaching was much stronger than between the work of researchers in science and their teaching.

2.10 Hattie and Marsh (1996) argue "*the aim is to increase the circumstances in which teaching and research have occasion to meet".* Reward systems and funding mechanisms to aid this "meeting" of research and teaching clearly have an influence. As Jenkins (2000b) concludes, "*It appears that how national systems fund and review teaching and research effects how staff and institutions see their role and the extent to which they effectively link student learning and discipline-based research."*

2.11 Exploring the relationship between teaching and research, Coate, Barnett and Williams (2001) posited and investigated six potential situations namely:

- Considerable overlap between the two
- Research has a positive influence on teaching
- Teaching has a positive influence on research
- The two are independent of each other
- Research has a negative influence on teaching
- Teaching has a negative influence on research.

They uncovered some evidence for each situation in their study, although the more commonly held assumptions especially amongst active researchers were either in favour of overlap or a positive relationship between research and teaching.

Nonetheless they did find evidence of tensions, and even stress, with the demands of accountability being cited by interviewers as leading to deprofessionalisation and reflecting a lack (or loss) of trust.

2.12 The indicators which they considered could be evidenced as signs of greater attention to the quality and effectiveness of teaching included use of teaching excellence in promotion policies, and funding for research on pedagogical issues. Nonetheless, the prevailing climate in many institutions continued to recognise research as a primary driver of academic activity. Whilst that was echoed in the findings from in-depth interviews on academic identities reported by Henkel (2000), the latter study provided detailed information about the complex forms of research and teaching identities, the extent to which these are changing, and what relationships, if any, existed between those major components of academic identities, with disciplinary allegiance emerging as a major influence.

2.13 The study by Coate, Barnett and Williams was undertaken for HEFCE as part of the report by J M Consulting on interactions between teaching, learning and other academic activities (March 2000). In their recent article (2001) Coate et al aired two principal strategic choices, either that more explicit management strategies be developed which connect teaching and research, or that scholarship be considered as an activity in its own right.

Definitions of scholarship

2.14 The project of redefining scholarship has itself generated a debate about what scholarship is (Andresen, 2000; Brown, 1997; Cunsolo et al. 1996; Huber, in Hutchings, 2000; Kreber, 2000) and more particularly what the scholarship of teaching is. In the early part of the previous decade, Boyer (1990) was seen as leading the vanguard of those championing a new understanding of the scholarship of teaching. His position was elaborated by Rice (1992) and Shulman (1993). There are those emerging who either argue that his position failed to make some key distinction between scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching (Richlin, 2000) or that he was too trapped in a product-orientated view of scholarship (Kreber, 2000, and Kreber and Cranton, 2000). Others have worked on refining an understanding of scholarship by applying selected theoretical frameworks to interpret it (Paulsen & Feldman, 1995; Cunsolo et al, 1996).

2.15 We shall now examine some studies which have analysed the concept of scholarship.

Shulman's (1993) view is that scholarship entails communities of engagement, through which conversation can be fostered and evaluation of ideas can take place, and that there are artefacts or products that can be critiqued through processes of peer review. Kreber and Cranton (2000) further argue for a process view of scholarship which encourages broad-based collegial engagement. In contrast to those who have emphasised the importance of publications, Kreber (2000) asks the question whether scholarship is a goal to be attained or a process to be maintained. She

argues that a product orientated view of scholarship leads to professors concentrating on numbers of contributions and over emphasising output rather than the quality of the process of scholarship.

Andresen (2000) argues for three "quintessential scholarly attributes". The first of these is critical reflectivity based on a set of values such as honesty, integrity, open-mindedness, scepticism, intellectual humility. The second, inherent in these values, is the willingness of academics to make learning open to public scrutiny and challenge. This additionally implies a "commitment to publication" as an essential feature of scholarship. Thirdly, scholarship is driven by an "ethic of enquiry". This, according to Andresen, provides the motivation or drive for scholarship.

Glassick, Huber, Maeroff (1997) argue that any work of scholarship demonstrates six characteristics: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, reflective critique.

Scholarship of teaching

2.16 Boyer (1990), is often credited with being the originator of the debate about scholarship of teaching. He argued that the natural-science view of the university, deriving from the Germanic Humboldt tradition, over-valued pure research and has led to the devaluing of work related to teaching and learning. Boyer challenged the assumption that the only research of value is the creation of new knowledge through recognised research methods.

2.17 Boyer argued for a wider understanding of scholarship and proposes four categories of scholarship:

- Scholarship of discovery – traditional research
- Scholarship of integration, which involves making connections across the disciplines and placing specialities within a larger context
- Scholarship of application (now renamed as service), including the practical application of knowledge
- Scholarship of teaching.

2.18 However, pre-dating Boyer by a decade, was Lawrence Stenhouse's work on building curriculum change through action research. Stenhouse, 1980, argues for a spirit of experimentation, co-operation and dogged persistence as the key characteristics of scholarship. Rice (1992) elaborated Boyer's definition by arguing for three areas of scholarship of teaching. Firstly there is what he terms "synoptic capacity", the ability to achieve coherence and meaning, place knowledge in context and open connections between knower and the known. Secondly, there is pedagogical content knowledge, which is about how to represent knowledge and, thirdly, there is "what we know about learning" which is about how students make meaning.

2.19 The theme of the centrality of learning to the scholarship of teaching has been taken up by Shulman (1999). In his most recent work, Shulman, in Hutchings (2000), has described four kinds of fidelity as being critical to the scholarship

of teaching: fidelity to the integrity of the discipline or field of study; fidelity to the learning of students one is committed to serve; fidelity to the society, polity, community and institution within which one works; and fidelity to the teacher's own identity and sense of self as scholar, teacher, valued colleague or friend.

2.20 Whereas some have argued that scholarship of teaching is the obligation of all teaching staff and have equated it with excellence in teaching, others have argued that there is a distinction between competence in teaching (expected of all) and scholarship of teaching, which will only be achieved by those who apply themselves to particular forms of enquiry into their teaching practice (Hutchings and Shulman, 1999).

2.21 Andresen and Webb (2000) argue that scholarship of teaching must be based on a number characteristics: an ethic of enquiry, being well-informed about the pedagogy of the discipline, being critically reflective, and involving a move from informal inquiry to more formal approaches in order to expand the horizon of the audience of the enquiry.

2.22 Trigwell, Martin, Benjamin and Prosser (2000) undertook a review of the literature and conducted an empirical enquiry into how academic staff experience scholarship of teaching. From staff descriptions of their understanding of scholarship of teaching they identified four categories: those who thought it was about knowing the literature; those who saw it as improving teaching; those who emphasised improving student learning (within one's own teaching); and those seeking to improve student learning - both generic and discipline. They develop a multi-dimensional model of scholarship of teaching with four dimensions: being informed about teaching, reflection on that information, communicating to others about teaching, and staff conception of their role. They argue that staff with a teacher-focused conception are more likely to conceive of scholarship of teaching as simply being informed; whereas those with a student-focused conception are more likely to be engaging in reflective practice, understanding their teaching and consulting and communicating with others. Benjamin (2000) elaborates on one aspect of this research by exploring how the scholarship of teaching practice was understood by a number of teaching teams.

2.23 Kreber and Cranton (2000) have elaborated on a model for both learning about teaching and demonstration of teaching knowledge. The model is based on Mezirov's three levels of reflection and Habermas's three types of knowledge – instrumental, practical and emancipatory. They argue that learning about teaching can be characterised by some combination of instrumental, communicative and emancipatory learning processes.

2.24 A major programme in the United States to promote scholarship of teaching is the Carnegie Foundation's Academy for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning (CASTL). Hutchings (2000) has described the aims as follows.

"CASTL is one of a number of programs of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching that aim to reinvigorate education by renewing the

connections between teaching and research. Foundation programs seek to foster forms of reflection and inquiry that will raise the level of attention to educational issues throughout American academic life. The long-term goal is to stimulate a fundamental shift in values, cultures and priorities of universities...a shift which in turn, make possible a re-framing of the teaching professions (CASTL, 2000: 7)." As Andresen (2000) has argued, summarising the approach of the Carnegie Foundation, scholarship of teaching is seen as potentially "transformative" bringing a *"fundamental challenge to the way one operates in academic work, hence practising our teaching in ways that embody and convey intellectual and educational integrity".*

2.25 Richlin (2000) makes the distinction between the scholarship of teaching and scholarly teaching. The latter implies that teaching is based on contemporary sources, is based on sound principles and research and can be expected of all teachers; whereas the scholarship of teaching is an investigation into, and peer reviewed publications about, teaching and learning processes and may only be undertaken by a minority of teachers.

2.26 The notion of scholarly teaching is also discussed by Andresen (2000: 143). This in Andresen's view means this *"...places the initial scholarly onus on teachers to locate their practice in the context of what is already known, and preferably the best of that. Such knowledge would comprise:*

- *the most recent knowledge in their disciplinary field;*
- *the most reliable pedagogic recommendations; and*
- *the most authoritative statements of the aims of university education, nationally and at the university and department level."*

2.27 Much of the recent discussion on the scholarship of learning and teaching has emphasised the importance of discipline-focused pedagogical research. The arguments used by Jenkins (2000) and Healey (2000a, 2000b and 2000c) in support of an approach which emphasises the role of discipline-based scholarship of teaching may be summarised as follows.

Academic staff are employed to teach and research within a discipline and most owe their primary allegiance to their subject/discipline. Teachers' knowledge of their discipline structure, its central methodologies and key concepts, impacts on how they teach. Students in different disciplines employ different learning styles that reflect the distinctive characteristics of the subject. Too much of the literature in learning and teaching loses its impact because it is too generic and speaks too broadly about learners without situating their learning within a subject. Teaching staff are more motivated to improve discipline-based teaching because it relates to their primary identity and because they can see the most immediate pay-off in their own work. This is reinforced because, it is argued, there are distinctive concerns within discipline groups that may not be shared with other disciplines. These may relate to particular challenges faced within a discipline, or to specialist teaching methods. As a result of all these factors there are separate bodies of literature within disciplines which reflect the scholarship relating to each

discipline. It is to this body of literature that academics relate and to which they wish to contribute.

2.28 Another angle on the importance of the subject is to argue that the scholarship of teaching is defined by the *"interplay between disciplinary research and the education of undergraduates"* (Martin et al, 1998). However, even when subject-based PedR is undertaken it has been accused of being too little and of poor quality. Taking the example of geography, where most analysis has been undertaken, it has been said that *"relatively few discipline-specialists publish research into the nature of learning and teaching in their subjects"* (Healey, 2000a). And when they do, *"lower standards of evidence and scholarship are demonstrated in discussions about the teaching of geography than those of the discipline per se"* (Jenkins,1997)

PedR

2.29 The differences and similarities between PedR and scholarship of teaching have not been a major focus of the higher education literature. A national group of higher education researchers and practitioners have been meeting over the past year to consider the question of the parameters of PedR. The reports from this group, which are available on a closed mailing list, indicate considerable consensus about what it includes/excludes as a research area. However, these views have not taken account of scholarship of teaching or again how PedR is different or similar to PedD. The consensus view of that group is that PedR is a broad church encompassing everything from individual investigations of classroom practices and systematic reflections on them to meta-analyses of macro and micro-level issues in higher education (Yorke: PedR web pages). In Entwistle (1998), a number of scholars argue for priorities in research in learning and teaching. The consensus of this seminar was that there was no shortage of research, but rather there was a problem in communicating the results of the research to the academic community.

2.30 The status and value of PedR is intimately linked to two kinds of separation which continue to be made despite all the arguments that have been brought against them. The first is the separation of teaching and research, and the second is the separation of research and scholarship, Rowland (2000). In both pairings discipline research is valued both over teaching and scholarship (Rowland, 1996; Yorke, 2000).

2.31 Daly (1994) argues that only a few staff will ever undertake PedR. *"Whether or not it has been justified by differences in quality, the education schools, where research on pedagogy has been traditionally located, have remained second class citizens at most American universities. Many college and university funding programs do not support pedagogical research proposals within the arts and sciences disciplines. Most disciplinary journals seldom publish pedagogical research. And most personnel committees do not give publications on pedagogy equal weight with more traditional scholarship. In short, the difficulty of doing quality research on pedagogy is increasing much faster than the rewards for doing it, as a result the proposal to bridge the gap between research and teaching by undertaking research on teaching is likely*

to attract few takers." This neatly summarises a continuing problem, which applies to the UK today as much as to the US.

2.32 Elton (2001) argues for a possible link between PedR and disciplinary teaching. This can be the result of a transfer of PedR results to teaching practice; the improvement of teaching practice through evaluatory research; action research in which academics combine the roles of researcher and teacher by researching into their own teaching; or teachers who are also pedagogic researchers.

Impact of the RAE

2.33 Brown (2000) has assembled considerable evidence that in UK universities disciplinary research is perceived to have the highest status, although undergraduate teaching is the main business of most higher education institutions; effort and resources are diverted into maximising RAE scores; and teaching is separated from research and scholarship. McNay (1999) has shown how the funding rewards the RAE offered led, at the level of the individual, the department and the institution to "a gradual separation structurally, of research from teaching". Heap (1999) has argued that institutions and departments have freed up time for active researchers by allocating extra teaching duties to non-research active staff. This focus upon research activity is most pronounced at the top end of the RAE scale, as the extra money received by the highly rated departments means that they need to spend less time on other income generating activities such as teaching (Heap, 1999).

Jenkins (2000b), has argued that *"whatever its (the RAE's) impact on research, it is having a negative impact on teaching".*

The HEFCE report on the consultation of the Review of Research (HEFCE 01/17), paragraph 26, states that the Teaching and Learning Committee "*will continue to review scholarship to establish whether there are issues at the boundary between scholarship and research....However, we consider that research intended to shed light upon the teaching of a subject is equivalent to other forms of research and should continue to compete for funding through the RAE as at present"* (HEFCE, 2001). The literature on the extent to which research on teaching is actually regarded as "equivalent" suggests that the sector remains ambivalent on this issue and that further work may need to be undertaken to understand better how RAE panels operationalise the present rules.

PedD

2.34 PedD publications are a rich resource for staff teaching in higher education, although not normally under this title. They are more likely to be called "educational development" or simply "learning and teaching" development. In the UK alone there are several specialist presses – Kogan Page/SEDA, Technical and Educational Press – as well as disciplinary journals such as the Journal of Geography in Higher Education, to support pedagogical

developments. Furthermore many HEIs publish internally the results of projects undertaken by academics on developing aspects of their teaching. The project reports from FDTL are another rich source of data. Most of this work centres on improving teaching and learning, assessment, course design and student learning. The extent to which this literature builds on pedagogical research or is "scholarly" in its approach varies considerably. It has been argued that less of it centres on theoretical and empirically-based understandings of teaching and learning in higher education than is desirable (Rowland, 2000). But on the other hand it is not clear that more theoretically sophisticated research-based writing would be read widely across the academic community. The challenge here is for pedagogical research to be more clearly communicated to the academic community.

2.35 In the pedagogical development literature influential theories have been the "approaches to study' work undertaken by Marton and Saljo (Marton et al, 1997; Marton and Booth, 1997), and translated into a more popular form through the work of Gibbs (1992) which has made familiar the distinctions between 'deep' and 'surface' approaches to learning. The work of Entwistle (2000) looking at student study behaviours and identifying students at risk has also been influential.

2.36 Writing on communities of practice in higher education, Malcolm and Zukas (2000) concluded that *"something very odd has happened in the field of university teaching"* (p60). Central to that deduction is their view that recent attempts to improve university teaching have not been based upon well-established disciplinary communities, or utilised the expertise, from practice and research, which universities have in the education of teachers.

2.37 Another central strand in their argument revolves around developing effective communities of situated practice, which links directly to the issue of building capacity for change. Influenced by their background and experience in adult education, Zukas and Malcolm argued strongly that the pedagogical model which involves the educator as a situated learner within a community of practice, appeared to offer greater utility than others – such as those of the reflective practitioner, or the facilitator of learning or quality assessor. They argue that the dominant model for educational development has been psychologically based and that *"despite its frequent focus on 'the learner', there is little recognition of the socio-cultural situatedness of the individual. The learner frequently appears as an anonymous, decontextualized, degendered being whose principal distinguishing characteristics are 'personality'; and 'learning style'"* (Zukas and Malcolm, 2000).

2.38 Such typologies are of considerable interest, although they may understate both the existence, and indeed merits, of multi-stranded or more eclectic approaches to practice and also of significant inter-disciplinary differences in orientation, approach and understanding. Put simply, critical practice may not mean the same thing in practical terms in a subject in the humanities as in one of the physical sciences.

Tribes, identities and careers

2.39 The second edition of "Academic Tribes and Territories" (Becher and Trowler, 2001) explores an interconnected range of topics in depth, interweaving research findings into theoretical perspectives. Of particular relevance to this study of capacity building for the scholarship of teaching are the substantial sections on academic disciplines, aspects of community life, academic careers and implications for theory and practice.

2.40 They discuss the general characteristics of disciplines, aspects of unity and culture, and of induction and socialisation, alongside counter-pressures and tensions caused by conflicting or changing paradigms, shifts in knowledge production and communication, and blurring of the territorial boundaries of many disciplines. It follows that the culture of a discipline, be it "settled" or hotly contested, influences the perceptions and values of its members, which, in turn, shapes individual academic careers, albeit through the prism of institution, gender, ethnicity, personality, performance and recognition.

2.41 They argue that more research is needed on the complex links between the disciplines and pedagogy, citing conclusions from Hativa and Marincovich (1995) which highlighted evidence indicating discipline-based differences in the ways in which teaching is conceived, conceptualised, translated and enacted. One specific illustration would be the different emphases on the relative importance of knowledge acquisition, application and integration.

2.42 Whilst Henkel's (2000) research on academic identities reinforces several of these messages, writing on teaching identities, she notes some widespread findings from her interviews. Notably these focused upon teaching satisfying personal desires to go on learning and to enable students to gain from the experiences and insights of the teacher.

2.43 Henkel (2000) found that teaching identities were affected by context i.e. the type of institution in which the individual practised.

2.44 The centrality and potential influences of disciplines has been recognised by HEFCE, notably through the TQEF and by QAA through the use of peer community members in subject review and the setting of benchmark statements.

2.45 Several important considerations flow from the foregoing about promoting and supporting effective staff development for pedagogical development, research and the scholarship of teaching and learning. There are significant questions about the ways in which the disciplines and institutions perform these functions and how other agencies and initiatives aid and integrate with these. Additionally there are questions about the appropriateness of different models and approaches, and whether those considerations are significantly sensitive to the cultural factors and forces outlined above.

2.46 A different, though related dimension surrounds the provenance and currency of the distilled, albeit selectively, evidence from pedagogical development

and/or research which underpins the values and criteria of ILT, or the codes of practice of QAA, or HEFCE guidelines on the formulation of learning and teaching strategies. The challenge of contextualising generic statements within the dialogues, conversations, understandings, mores and practices of a specific discipline or institution is substantial – and regularly confronts and complicates developmental endeavours and initiatives.

2.47 Badley (2001) has argued for an eclectic, tentative, and pragmatic scholarship of academic development as a means of addressing these dilemmas. Certainly a one-fit for all approach would appear singularly inappropriate. We suggest that rich multi-paradigm, multi-voiced and multi-stranded strategies and approaches would be a desirable goal. But a considerable amount of research, development and widespread discussion within the academic community and between key stakeholders, will be needed if that goal is to be progressed.

Building capacity

2.48 The resources that have been made available through the HEFCE's FDTL programme in England have been a source of discipline focused development work, where the primary emphasis has been dissemination rather than research. However, scholarship of teaching has been promoted through the work associated with some FDTL projects. For example the Atelier Principle of Teaching project, based at the School of Architecture, University of East London, has spawned several scholarly articles about problem-based learning (O'Reilly et al, 2000).

2.49 Output on capacity building is emerging from the work of the Carnegie Foundation, although a number of the other discussions of scholarship of teaching already cited – such as Trigwell et al (2000), Kreber and Cranton (2000), Andresen and Webb (2000) and Healey (2000a) – all make recommendations for capacity building. D'Andrea and Gosling (2000) have provided two case studies and also made a comparison of the approach of the Carnegie Foundation with the three level approach of the TQEF in the UK (Gosling and D'Andrea, 2000). The ILT website has featured pages on capacity building in scholarship of teaching by Healey, Trigwell, Jenkins, Gosling & D'Andrea. A current ESRC funded study by Skelton and Higgins (see Chapter 5) on understanding teaching excellence should also provide further insights.

Studies in progress

2.50 In addition to the research discussed above, brief mention is made here of some other recent surveys, particularly with respect to PedD:

(a) Castley (2000, unpublished), University College Northampton, recently concluded a survey of policies on the recognition of excellent teaching. Fifteen institutions responded to his survey. He identified five policy positions from that sample, namely:

- No policy or in flux
- Cash award given
- Recognition of individuals and departments
- Fellowships for a fixed period. Fellows have a specified developmental role
- Permanent or fixed term readerships or equivalent posts, normally with specified developmental roles for the recipients.

(b) Thompson (2000, mailbase circulation), Liverpool John Moores, recently completed a study on promoting and rewarding good teaching. She received 20 replies to her e-mail. Amongst the initial findings are indications of a growing number of linkages to support institutional objectives and learning and teaching strategies, although some respondents mentioned the complex issue of suitable criteria for recognition.

Items of interest are the increasing number of pre-1992 universities seeking progress in this area, either through new promoted posts and routes, e.g. Cambridge, Essex, Loughborough and Strathclyde, or via teaching prizes, e.g. Bath, Bradford and Lancaster.

(c) Gosling (1996), East London, reported on a survey of UK educational development units. In autumn 2000 he repeated the survey (Gosling, 2001) and found that the amount of research being undertaken by educational development centres had increased. New units had been formed, apparently directly as a consequence of the articulation of learning and teaching strategies and of the availability of TQEF monies in England and Northern Ireland. There had also been a growth in the size of units. Roles ranged widely with some units being narrowly focused but many handling extensive, and growing, portfolios. Remit and role are increasingly aligned to institutional mission and tradition. Thus Oxford and Nottingham emphasise research to inform practice in teaching and learning.

(d) McCarthy (2000, unpublished), ILT, has assembled examples of both institutional schemes and sector-wide examples of teaching fellowships and equivalent approaches to the recognition of excellence in teaching. International examples include: the US Professors of the Year Program; the 3M Teaching Fellowships and Awards in Canada; and the Australian Awards for University Teaching. The latter includes three types of award:

- Up to eight awards to individual teachers
- The Prime Minister's Award for University Teacher of the Year
- Up to three institutional awards for the provision of support services to Australian students, to international students, and educational services to the local and/or regional community.

In 2000 the first 20 National Teaching Fellowships were awarded in England and Northern Ireland, and further successful cohorts received awards in 2001 and 2002.

(e) Coffey (2000, e-mail communication), Open University, used a SEDA small research grant to conduct a questionnaire survey into a number of aspects of educational development programmes for both new and experienced teachers in higher education. The survey is focused upon the stated outcomes of the programmes and the evaluation methods adopted.

2.51 The topic of promoting and supporting effective PedD and scholarship of teaching is increasingly featuring in the literature and in conference presentations. Recent examples of the latter include Brown (2000), D'Andrea and Gosling (2000), and Gordon (2000a). The ILT held a symposium on the scholarship of teaching (Healey (2000d), Gibbs (2000), Gordon (2000b) and MacDonald (2000). In July 2000 Issue No. 2, Volume 19 of *Higher Education Research and Development* was devoted to the scholarship of teaching. The articles discussed models and concepts of the scholarship of teaching (Andresen 2000, Benjamin 2000, Trigwell et al, 2000), work-based learning, (Reeders, 2000), new learning environments (Jamieson et al 2000), discipline-based approaches (Healey, 2000), and the impact of the corporate university (McWilliam, et al 2000).

Further the first annual UK/US Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Conference was held in London in June 2001. This brought together UK National Teaching Fellows and US Carnegie Scholars and attracted a rich array of contributions and considerable interest.

2.52 One strand of the Association of Commonwealth Universities/European Centre for Strategic Management of Universities 2000/2001 elective European benchmarking studies included teaching, learning and assessment. An extensive questionnaire was distributed to participating institutions. The responses and supporting evidence were used as a basis for the benchmarking and the preparation of good practice statements which were discussed at a closed event held at the University of Amsterdam in June 2001.

Overview

2.53 Several points can be highlighted from the foregoing account. Overall much of the extensive literature on PedD is perceived to be uninterrogated, under-theorised and reliant on a few influential concepts such as deep and surface learning. Most of it aims to provide practical advice on what is considered to be good practice in teaching and its impact on learning, based on experiential understanding and knowledge. But only rarely are these linked to the research on teaching and learning in higher education. On the other hand, the PedR and some of the scholarship of teaching literature do take account of higher education research but remain inconsistently defined by researchers in the field. In addition, neither of the areas (separately or together) has created a

systematic body of research which can, at this juncture, be called the foundation of a field of study. Moreover it lacks aggregated meta-analyses that can provide scholars with the guidance they need to take the field forward.

2.54 A first practical step towards the development of an aggregated meta-analysis would be the commissioning of a study of the discipline journals published in the UK, to gain a fuller understanding of the volume and quality of work which could be regarded as contributing to the scholarship of teaching. Weimer (1993) undertook such a survey of the disciplinary journals in the US, and a similar survey was undertaken in Canada (Cunsolo et al, 1996). Jenkins (2000a) and Healey (2000a) have analysed the geography journals, but to our knowledge there has not been a comprehensive survey of disciplinary journals in the UK.

Research cited above, and elsewhere in this report indicates that the concepts of the scholarship of teaching, pedagogic development and pedagogical research require further articulation and refinement. For many practitioners it would neither be meaningful nor acceptable to attempt to separate artificially what they perceive as dual, and at least partially connected components of their academic identity.

Chapter 3 Promoting and supporting pedagogical development and pedagogical research in higher education

Introduction

3.1 This chapter is based upon an initial mapping exercise undertaken by Professor Gordon for HEFCE in November 2000. It illustrates activity at various levels, offers a preliminary analysis of trends and provisional suggestions about gaps, and some key areas that would merit reinforcement, extension or attention.

3.2 The issue of effective professional, or pedagogical development, in higher education has been a matter of recurrent and interconnecting interest in discussions at several HEFCE committees in recent months. In substantial measure these discussions are underpinned by the growing awareness that higher education is experiencing significant, possibly accelerating, changes in practice, practitioners, methods, understandings and expectations in relation to learning and teaching. These are occurring in a complex environment. Institutions seek to retain a substantial measure of autonomy. Individual academics are socialised by their disciplines and by traditions of academic freedom, which led Elton to describe traditional approaches to learning and teaching in higher education as a "cottage industry". Yet there are powerful forces of change both from within and beyond the academy. Foremost amongst these are: the possible influences of new technologies on learning and teaching; the implications for curricula, assessment and practice of mass higher education and lifelong learning; the gradual development of more formalised means of induction and continuing professional development (CPD) for university teachers, as evidenced by the work of the ILT; and wider efforts to promote debate on, and development of, the role of learning and teaching within the agenda of higher education, particularly as a source of enrichment and enhancement of educational provision and practice at all levels within the system and within institutions. A further catalyst for re-evaluation has been discussions over the relationship between research and teaching which was highlighted in the HEFCE Fundamental Review of Research Policy and Funding (HEFCE 00/37).

Methodology

3.3 The mapping exercise involved conducting telephone interviews and assembling information from a number of sources and levels. These can be grouped under four headings, namely:

- The funding bodies (HEFCE, SHEFC, HEFCW)
- Central agencies with a role in supporting staff development, e.g. ILT, LTSN, HESDA, QAA
- Unions (AUT, NATFHE)
- Examples of studies in progress which are being undertaken by other individuals and groups.

This mapping of the territory is intended to be illustrative not exhaustive. In particular it was considered unnecessary to endeavour to produce a comprehensive listing of actions and initiatives of the funding bodies, such as those supported by the TQEF.

HEFCE

3.4 The Council exercises considerable influence in shaping operational and strategic climates, framing debates, stimulating change and promoting dissemination of, and reflection on, good practice. Notable recent examples have included:

- Introduction of the TQEF. Since the projects supported by the Fund for the Development of Teaching and Learning (FDTL) are all directed towards promoting and disseminating good practice, it can be concluded that the principal purposes relate to pedagogical development

- The 31 Teaching and Learning Technology Programme (TLTP3) projects arguably attach greater attention than earlier phases to dissemination and changing practice. Although, perhaps inevitably, TLTP projects have tended explicitly to emphasise "stuff" development, rather than staff development. Much of the "stuff" from earlier phases dated rapidly (both in content and technology), whilst one of the lasting "outcomes" has been the creation, perhaps somewhat expensively, of a "pool" of C&IT developers. Some of those who gained experience from these projects have remained within the system, providing a pool of scarce talent to work on other projects and institutional initiatives. Many of these individuals play influential roles within core dimensions of the learning and teaching strategies of HEFCE-funded institutions, and in equivalent units in other HEIs

- The funding released to institutions upon receipt of an approved learning and teaching strategy is explicitly intended to be a lever for change and a means of supporting PedD. The evaluation of TQEF which has been undertaken provides some evidence of the impact of this policy. Information assembled from several sources indicates that visible developments are taking place, such as the founding of new Centres within institutions; the growth (and often redirection) of existing Centres; and the strengthening of strategic linkages between policies, practitioners and sources of support and advice. The reviews for HEFCE of HEIs' learning and teaching strategies (Gibbs) provide additional details and illustrations, as well as identifying areas which may merit further attention.

SHEFC

3.5 Several years ago SHEFC released one-off unattached development funding to Scottish HEIs in what could be viewed as a forebearer of the more closely defined HEFCE learning and teaching strategy approach. Whilst one-off funding was welcomed by institutions, the absence of continuity was an issue for both parties.

3.6 Subsequently, SHEFC has favoured targeted initiatives. Of immediate relevance to pedagogical development are the 8 staff development projects within the SHEFC C&IT Programme:

- Scottish Electronic Staff Development Library
- Enabling Large-Scale Institutional Implementation of C&IT
- Effective Learning: Resources for Staff Development
- Online Tutoring Skills
- Visual Arts Technology Staff Development for Scottish Arts Schools
- Guides and Tools to Support C&IT in Teaching and Learning
- Multimedia Approach to Profiles and Portfolios
- NetCulture Staff Development Network.

Additionally there are 8 generic web tools projects and two intranet projects. Dissemination events have been held as have focus groups and other activities.

3.7 NetCulture has produced a Briefing paper on Frameworks for staff/pedagogical development in C&IT in learning and teaching. Drawing upon evidence gleaned from a needs analysis, the Briefing Paper reported that:

"The staff development community believe that within their institutions there is:

- *a lack of time, financial and people resources for staff development in relation to supporting the application of C&IT in learning and teaching*
- *a lack of strategic development in institutions for implementation of C&IT in learning and teaching*
- *a lack of recognition of the importance to a university of staff development in advancing the application of C&IT in learning and teaching".*

Staff and educational developers within institutions are collaborating with the NetCulture team to produce tools and resources to address needs but strategic decisions are clearly required to deal with the items highlighted above (see http://netculture.scotcit.ac.uk)

3.8 SHEFC funded a substantial number of developments under Strands 2 and 3 of the Use of MANs (Metropolitan Area Networks) Initiative. Of these TALiSMAN had the clearest and broadest PedD focus. Most of the other projects dealt with specific fields/disciplines or focused upon enabling technologies and supporting forms of learning, although Netware Training produced materials for staff using Novell networks.

3.9 A different example of targeting is the Creating an Accessible Curriculum initiative, led by Strathclyde University, which is pursuing educational and staff development as a means of removing barriers within higher education for students with disabilities. Initially focused upon five institutions in West

Central Scotland, the second phase of the project is funding developmental work in 13 institutions using an audit tool generated in Phase One.

3.10 In 1999/2000 SHEFC released £50k per annum for a period of three years to each Scottish HEI to enable them to progress human resource development initiatives. SHEFC suggested that priority should be attached to progressing toward recognition by Investors in People, although institutions were able to determine and define their own foci. Strategies also included supporting staff in attaining membership of the ILT, and various initiatives directed at the management development of specific groups, e.g. heads of departments, leaders of tomorrow.

3.11 Other projects have promoted the development of particular groups of staff (e.g. contract research staff) or of strategic priorities (largely through the mechanism of Strategic Change Grants). Some of these have had some impact upon PedD, but rarely on a widespread scale.

HEFCW

3.12 In May 2000 the Council issued two circulars to institutions dealing respectively with learning and teaching strategies and with work experience and employability plans. The former is supported by an annual Learning and Teaching Fund of £0.5M. Annex A in the Circular indicated the allocations which each institution would receive in 2000/01, subject to receipt of an acceptable strategy. The amounts ranged from £15k to £80k. Reference was made to HEFCE's Institutional Learning and Teaching Strategies: A guide to good practice (Gibbs 1999).

3.13 In addition to general guidance about the nature and format of institutional strategies, HEFCW wished four areas to be considered, namely:

- Graduate employability
- Staff development and the ILT
- Awareness of other initiatives
- Links with other institutional strategies and plans (e.g. recruitment, curriculum and course portfolio development, capital investment in C&IT and other learning and teaching infrastructure, widening access and lifelong learning, quality assurance and assessment and the maintenance of standards, Welsh Medium Provision; provision for students with disabilities, estates, information systems and services).

The strategies have been received and funds released, in some cases after further clarification and refinement.

The Welsh National Assembly conducted a review of higher education in 2001. Foci included: recruitment to Welsh institutions; responding to employers' needs and to the changing nature of the Welsh economy; and achieving synergy across the whole post-16 provision of education.

Central agencies

3.14 In this section, the contribution of various national agencies to PedD are considered.

Institute for Learning and Teaching (ILT)

3.15 In the 1999/2000 Annual Report the principal activities of the ILT are listed as:

- *"accrediting programmes of staff development in higher education;*
- *developing individual routes to membership;*
- *providing support for those engaged in facilitating learning and teaching;*
- *stimulating innovation"*

By November 2002 the Institute had over 14,400 members, and 134 programmes (substantially focused on PedD) had been accredited. Indeed it is the latter area which represents a major sea change which is taking place within HEIs. Now few institutions do not have a programme in place and an increasing number are expecting, or requiring, new staff to undertake this form of initial development.

The ILT has reached agreements with a number professional bodies, to date primarily health-related professions, and it expects the number and range to grow over time.

The ILT commissioned a project to manage a CPD pilot, which will include PedD. The project involves:

- Co-ordinating and facilitating networks of individual participants
- Engaging partner organisations such as HEIs and professional bodies in CPD activities
- Organising and facilitating a small number of workshop events
- Monitoring activities and progress
- Evaluation of the project.

ILT membership services include events, publications, networking and the website. The ILT has now held three annual conferences (in June), the symposium in October 2000 on the scholarship of teaching, and several other seminars and symposia. These events are attracting interest although the ILT remains largely at the early adopter phase of development, with many academics and various constituencies – ranging from Vice-Chancellors, through subject groupings and AUT – expressing ambivalence, disappointment and/or reservations.

Learning and Teaching Support Network (LTSN)

3.16 The LTSN has two major dimensions which relate to PedD: the 24 subject centres and the Generic Centre. Inevitably the former will concentrate upon their individual constituencies (some of which are multiple, because of the combination of two or more subjects under one specific centre). They are

actively contacting these constituencies and establishing dialogue about services and priorities as well as raising awareness of their existence. They must quickly become major sources of dissemination, interaction and reflection. Obvious potential challenges are efficiency and effectiveness of communication, perceived relevance, knowledge explosion and fragmentation, widely-ranging individual and localised needs, and the ability to contextualise innovations, experiments and practices developed in different settings, or for different situations.

3.17 By October 2000 the Generic Centre had formulated six key strategic aims, namely:

- To be the primary information resource for generic learning and teaching practices
- To promote, transfer and broker good innovative learning and teaching practices
- To be an active partner in the development of the LTSN network
- To support the development and implementation of HEI's learning and teaching strategies
- To develop a co-ordinated and coherent approach to enhancing learning and teaching by working in partnership with appropriate stakeholders
- To contribute to the development of the LTSN network with appropriate position and capacity to support the delivery of learning and teaching-related national policy objectives.

3.18 In the strategic plan for the Generic Centre each strategic aim was matched to executive aims, outcomes and performance measures. For example within the penultimate key strategic aim, an executive aim is to promote discussion and debate about learning and teaching developments. The matching performance measures are a wider range of staff engaged in discussion of learning and teaching, and evidence of more extensive discussion within the HE community.

3.19 The case for a matrix structure for LTSN which marries subject and generic perspectives is persuasive. But translating that into extensive effective and pervasive PedD will be a demanding challenge, which is likely to be perceived as failing without the active support of most, if not all, stakeholders i.e. discipline associations, staff unions, ILT, institutions, students associations, funding bodies, CVCP, SCOP.

3.20 A team from Lancaster University has been commissioned to undertake the initial evaluation of LTSN. A significant developmental component is included in the requirements for the evaluation. An early question which the evaluators have posed to LTSN, is what model(s) of change are being used/presumed? A challenging query which should promote useful reflection and debate to inform strategic evolution.

Higher Education Staff Development Agency (HESDA)

3.21 The remit of the Agency spans all staff in HE and all roles and activities. Not surprisingly, therefore, PedD is only one area of interest. Apart from the involvement of HESDA (formerly UCoSDA) in the development of the ILT and the training of quality assessors and subject reviewers, much of the work on PedD has revolved around task forces (e.g. see Elton and Partington 1991) or projects, and ensuing publications. Recent activities included work on competencies and mapping specific institutional programmes for staff development against these. Currently HESDA/THETO (The Higher Education Training Organisation) is involved in a joint project with NATFHE, AUT, the University of Brighton and University College Chichester, to use monies from the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) Union Learning Fund to investigate the learning needs of part-time lecturers in HE, particularly in relation to satisfying the requirements for membership of the ILT. In collaboration with Universities Scotland, HESDA funded the Scottish-based PROMOTE project which investigated the impact of different pedagogically-related posts on teaching and learning in Scottish HEIs and explored the experience of postholders.

Staff and Educational Development Association (SEDA), Society for Research into Higher Education (SRHE) and regional groupings

3.22 SEDA and SRHE are both important players. With a focus upon staff and educational development, SEDA has a clear PedD focus with a primary interest in effective learning and teaching and a strong track record of innovative development, including the SEDA scheme for accrediting university teachers. The SRHE has a dominant research focus (PedR). It generally attracts larger attendance at the annual conference when the theme is related to learning and teaching. In October 2000 SRHE launched an academic practice network and in June 2000 it held a conference at Stirling on Innovation and Creativity in Learning and Teaching. SRHE and SEDA also have a joint educational development research network to support the growth of PedR. The joint SEDA/AISHE Spring Conference 2002, in Dublin, discussed "Supporting and Evaluating Change: enhancing the practice of scholarship of learning, teaching and assessment".

3.23 Universities Scotland has a Learning and Teaching Committee and a supporting sub-committee concentrating upon related educational and staff development. Elsewhere other semi-formal regional and interest groupings exist within the UK, acting as catalysts and sources of sharing and awareness-raising.

3.24 Some activities of JISC and some DfES projects also impact, at least in part, upon PedD. In the case of JISC these principally relate to effective use of C&IT in teaching and learning, and the development needs of, and provision for, the emerging community of specialist support staff and researchers in the development and use of new technologies in teaching and learning.

3.25 Beetham et al (2001) authored a scoping study for JISC on "Career Development of Learning Technology Staff". The study identified several roles for "new specialists", including educational developer, educational researcher, technical researcher/developer, materials developer, project manager and general learning technologist. Typically these practitioners were in their late twenties or thirties on fixed-term contracts, and had worked in higher education for less than four years, and for less than two in their current post.

Four other groupings were utilised in the study, namely educational developers, academics and established professionals (which included academic innovators and academic managers), and learning support professionals. The growth of these roles represents an important trend towards professionalising support for PedD and, to a lesser extent, PedR.

3.26 Extrapolation of the data from the study suggested that some 7500 learning technology specialist staff worked in UK universities. Additionally probably some 8000 academic staff were actively involved in using learning technologies in their learning and teaching, although that figure is sensitive to defining criteria. Nonetheless in aggregate these individuals represent a distinctive and sizeable cohort certainly contributing to PedD and, to a lesser extent, to PedR and the scholarship of learning and teaching.

3.27 The report made 13 recommendations to JISC and 21 which were directed to senior managers in institutions. Interestingly the majority of the latter set of recommendations dealt with institutional change.

3.28 Another source of PedD has arisen from the raft of projects sponsored by DfES. In particular projects on key skills development, personal development planning, careers education and recording achievement have been both widely reported and feature prominently amongst current key objectives of the learning and teaching strategies of many English HEIs, as institutions seek to target TQEF monies to accelerate development and implementation.

Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA)

3.29 There has been an expectation, even presumption, within the funding bodies, the former Higher Education Quality Council (HEQC) and now the QAA, that the procedures for external scrutiny of the quality assurance of educational provision within higher education are a significant source of educational and staff development. There is little unqualified support for these assumptions in the evaluative literature. Three major conclusions appear to feature recurrently. Firstly, the goal is more likely to be achieved when the balance shifts more towards encouragement of enhancement and formative reporting than assurance and summative judgements. Secondly it is accepted that those directly involved in the process, particularly as assessors or reviewers, experienced significant personal staff development because of the insights which they gain of practice elsewhere. Finally, for institutions and departments the greatest educational developmental gains accrue from preparation, especially stock-taking and critical self-evaluation, with less

seemingly arising from the published reports. It has been argued that direct post-report developmental gains may be under-estimated due to the complex ways and timescales in which consequential actions and enhancements occur. That said, the evidence available appears to match with research on the relatively disappointing learning gains of students from feedback upon essays and similar arrangements. On a positive note, institutions do appear to learn actively about the processes and procedures of external assessment.

3.30 QAA also shapes the climate, notably through the numerous precepts in the code of practice. By using peer groups to generate benchmark statements, peers to act as reviewers, and relevant communities to inform the development of sections of the code of practice, it has sought to involve stakeholders, in a sense working with the underlying grain of the academy. However since that underlying grain is a fractionalised even an individualised one, that approach does not ensure or secure explicit connectivity between policy and practice or development and evaluation, nor does it facilitate the need to cross levels within institutions or address newer and more flexible frameworks and situations.

The current uncertainties and heated debate surrounding the processes which should be used in any external quality assurance evidence these tensions.

Association of University Teachers (AUT)

3.31 The AUT has undertaken a study entitled "Building the academic team", which looks at the contribution of academic related staff to the delivery of higher education. The report follows upon arguments in the Dearing Report and the Bett Report. The AUT document drew upon information supplied by AUT members in response to two questionnaires. Both used open-ended questions, so the report is laced with short quotations from responses to illustrate views and needs. Four groups of replies are explored (administrators, computer staff, library staff, and other related staff). It provides useful qualitative perspectives of a changing scene in which a much wider range of staff have some input into learning and teaching (PedD). It also suggests that there is a need for more expansive and embracing definitions of those involved, and in consequence of the array of developmental requirements, motivational issues and strategic implications and connections.

Data

3.32 Whilst caution must always be exercised over the assembling of large volumes of data, paucity of information, or significant gaps, or perceptions of rapid change without adequate detailed information, are likely to impede policy-making.

Qualifications and Membership of ILT

3.33 Launched in 1999, the ILT arose directly from key recommendations in the "Report of the National Committee into Higher Education" (Dearing Report). It is intended to be a professional body for all who teach and support learning in

higher education. Amongst the principal activities are the accreditation of programmes of training of relevant staff in support of their roles in teaching and learning; stimulation of innovation and sharing of good practice; and related research, development and scholarship. Enrolment in ILT has been encouraging and broadly been in line with the business plan. That said at the present rate it would take some time before the majority of relevant staff are members.

3.34 Many institutions now have programmes which have been, or soon will be, accredited by the ILT. It would be useful if the ILT prepared a report for the sector capturing the nature and range of this provision and their contribution to PedD and PedR.

Dissemination

3.35 Progress has been made by the Council in promoting the dissemination of findings, outputs and experiences from funded projects and initiatives. However scope remains to enhance dissemination and to foster evaluation.

Staff development for using C&IT in learning and teaching

3.36 Currently this is possibly one of the most challenging areas of staff and pedagogical development in higher education. Individuals and institutions differ greatly in their capabilities and needs, both technically and pedagogically. Multiple platforms, systems and software add to the complexity. That said, interesting developments are taking place.

Possible areas that merit further action

3.37 It would probably be unhelpful to generate an exhaustive list, so a small number of topics have been selected for consideration. These are:

- Research on institutional practice
- Investigation of the critical success factors of staff and/or educational development centres (or equivalent) and also of institutional strategies and policies
- Funding a project on peer observation of teaching
- Funding a project on competencies in assessment (e.g. reliability, validity, matching assessment to learning outcomes, assessment of key skills, assessment linked to levels in the qualifications framework)
- Linking further funding of learning and teaching strategies to evidence of evaluation and embedding
- Investigating the impact of ILT accredited courses
- Promoting developmental work on meanings of the scholarship of, and for, teaching
- Developing an integrated and co-ordinated approach to staff and educational development for learning and teaching
- Addressing key questions raised in the UUK report on "Borderless Education" (page 150), in relation to persuading staff to invest in personal development to progress the use of C&IT in learning and teaching. It is

worth noting that the study by Beetham et al. for JISC estimated that, by 2000, only around ten percent of academics were actually developing the use of C&IT in teaching and learning.

Chapter 4 E-mail questionnaire based survey

Introduction

4.1 Our proposal was to explore definitions of the scholarship of teaching used by HEIs, to identify the range of topics included under this umbrella term, and to explore the potential for building capacity in the scholarship of teaching. To do this a questionnaire was sent out to contacts within 104 UK HEIs. The questionnaire was targeted at, and therefore sent to, Pro Vice-Chancellors (Academic) and Heads of Teaching and Learning Units, wherever individuals could be identified – through for example the HESDA contacts resources, the HEDG e-mail contact list and other contacts of the team members involved in this survey.

The e-mail questionnaire survey

4.2 In total 186 individuals were targeted. Of this number 16 of the e-mail messages were returned as "recipient unknown". The total number of responses received was 50, representing a return of approximately 28%. Of these 50 responses 7 people responded to indicate that within the short timescale given, they felt unable to engage with what they described as challenging questions which required considerable time and thought. Most of the questionnaire responses came from staff working within higher educational development units, with only 8 coming directly from Pro Vice-Chancellors or other senior academic staff.

The outcomes

4.3 For convenience, the key messages from responses to each of the questions have been summarised below.

<u>What is your understanding of pedagogical development: what activities does it include?</u>

4.4 Several respondents indicated that "pedagogical development" was not a term with which they are familiar but considered that it was another term for *"curriculum development in its broadest sense, the how of teaching"*. This could include bringing to the attention of disciplinary based staff the body of research evidence that exists on teaching and learning in higher education and endeavouring to promote a culture of inquiry with respect to teaching, learning and assessment.

4.5 Other responses defined "pedagogical development" as *"the scholarly interrogation of taken for granted teaching and learning practice to move closer to a 'classroom' practice which is research/evidence based"*. Many people considered pedagogical development to encompass all aspects of the learning environment including teaching, resource provision, systems and procedures. For example:

"Pedagogical development embraces any activities conducted for the purpose

of enhancing the quality or effectiveness of learning, teaching, assessment and course management in higher education. I would not exclude any activity a priori, but activities commonly pursued within pedagogical development include, in my view:

- *induction and continuing professional development workshops, seminars, short courses, award-bearing programmes, guided self-study (whether undertaken at the course/ departmental/ faculty/institutional/ cross-institutional/ cross-national level)*

- *the preparation and dissemination of resource materials, including those specially prepared for particular target-groups/purposes as well as material in the public domain (e.g. journal articles, reports, books)*

- *guidance and support to individuals and groups (teaching and support staff and students)*

- *advice and support -- including. funding schemes (seedcorn/pump-priming) for new curricular, teaching-learning and assessment developments and initiatives*

- *identifying, documenting and disseminating information about 'good practices' (new and established practices, i.e. not only significant innovations)*

- *strategic support for policy development and policy implementation in relation to teaching, learning and assessment. "*

4.6 Essentially, the activities associated with "pedagogical development" were considered to comprise two key elements: one the one hand, processes of innovation in the activities of the teacher in the classroom which are intended to encourage independent learning. On the other hand, pedagogical development includes the intellectual development in teachers' thinking about, and understanding of, their own teaching and their students' learning.

What is your understanding of pedagogical research: what does it include?

4.7 Pedagogical research was often referred to as the next stage on from reflective practice in the classroom, i.e. undertaking qualitative research to inform policy development with respect to teaching, learning and assessment:

"Research is needed to find out (a) what works best in what contexts for different types of learners and (b) what processes best help teachers become more effective learning facilitators".

4.8 Several respondents indicated that "action research in the classroom", focusing on understanding more about student learning and involving close input from learners about their experiences, should be eclectic to the disciplinary base but tightly focused on appropriate research questions.

According to many of the responses, pedagogical research should be about opening up new ideas, new practices to reflect emerging needs, styles and modes of teaching and learning, and requires individuals to critically reflect on their own practice.

4.9 There were some views expressed that pedagogical research is stifled by the expectation that it can fit neatly in with the scientific notion of research which is designed to prove an hypothesis by using an "accepted" methodology. Whereas in fact teaching and learning research should draw on research paradigms more akin to those employed in sociology, psychology and philosophy.

What is your understanding of the scholarship of teaching: what does it include?

4.10 According to the responses the scholarship of teaching encompasses systematic review, meta analysis, secondary research and critical reflection on practice and the discovery of fresh insights into one's practice:

"In order to be an effective teacher it is necessary to be aware of the theories, which underpin teaching practice. This would include learning theories (e.g. Gagne, Skinner, Gestalt, Maslow, Rogers.) In addition, an understanding of the fundamentals of communication processes is important, including counselling theories and the nature of psychology. Finally there are important ideas concerned with the mechanics or strategies of teaching such as curriculum design, learning objectives, classroom management and so on. (e.g Bloom, Borman, Labov.) There are also of course a number of publications, which describe and discuss various teaching strategies (e.g. Gibbs, Jacques, Race, Brown)."

The scholarship of teaching is described as *"the active seeking of information about teaching and learning by a teacher with the intention of expanding their knowledge and applying it to their own teaching practice. It includes carrying out their own research or being informed about the pedagogical research of others in general and disciplinary-based areas. Studying for awards in teaching and learning would be included in this e.g. postgraduate accredited programmes".*

4.11 Almost all respondents commented on the importance of reflection on one's own practice, based on an awareness of research and developments in teaching, and developing an underpinning rationale for adopting certain approaches to curriculum delivery. The "scholarly" teacher may move through a spectrum from being a reflective practitioner, through to having knowledge of and engaging with the research literature, through to being a pedagogic researcher.

Some comments suggested that it is at the level of scholarship that the biggest impact on mainstream teaching may be first noted and engaged.

Are you aware of opportunities available to academic staff to engage with pedagogical development? What can you tell me about these opportunities and how they are taken up?

4.12 Many respondents indicated that within their institutions, new and experienced staff are encouraged to gain an initial teaching qualification through in-house certificated CPD courses. However, others stated that the scholarly content of such programmes is highly variable.

4.13 Within some institutions, pedagogical development is stated to be an integral element in the development of institutional teaching and learning strategies. Several people commented that while pedagogical development is the responsibility of the individual and that a variety of staff development opportunities is available, take up is low because pedagogical research and development lack status in comparison with traditional research activities.

4.14 Pedagogical development is not seen as valued by the institution. Some responses indicated that there is beginning to be engagement with networks such as LTSN and ALT; others indicated that LTSN was as yet making little impact. Membership of the ILT and the SEDA Fellowship scheme were seen by many respondents as positive opportunities.

4.15 There was a strong belief that pedagogical development should be encouraged within the "disciplinary base" but that in-situ consultancy is expensive and time-consuming and not well resourced. An interest in pedagogical development with the intention of feeding ideas and findings into the development of practice is not apparent. Development activities are increasing significantly but the demand for them has to be created, and staff have to be convinced of the value.

4.16 Some respondents gave quite detailed accounts of their wide ranging role in creating and disseminating pedagogical development activities e.g.

"Opportunities and activities include:

- *A staff development programme of workshops and other events;*
- *Support for departments developing their pedagogy;*
- *A mandatory introductory course on teaching and learning for probationary staff;*
- *Development of an ILT accredited programme for academic staff and associated teaching staff;*
- *Provision of funding for projects in teaching and learning, including the use of learning technology;*
- *Support networks for teaching assistants and others;*
- *Postgraduate course in education (award-bearing)".*

The opportunities for workshops are widely advertised by paper and electronic means, but are taken up by a relatively small number of academic staff, usually more junior staff. Initiatives at departmental level have tried to address this issue and involve a wider range of staff. Courses for teaching assistants and demonstrators are more popular due to the requirement for

training before they can teach. Funding for projects is taken up by a wider range (both discipline and grade) of academic staff."

What gaps (if any) do you perceive in the professional development available to academic staff which impact on pedagogical development?

4.17 The key issues highlighted in the responses to this question were: lack of time and motivation; lack of any statutory requirement to become qualified as a teacher in higher education; the lack of emphasis on appropriate development opportunities targeted at experienced staff; the need for disciplinary translation of pedagogical research and development; the inaccessibility of much of the pedagogical literature for disciplinary based staff. Many of these issues are clearly expressed in the following response:

- *"Activities which bring together staff in cognate subject areas from different institutions, hopefully the new Subject Teaching Centres will make some headway on this*
- *Funding to encourage and support curriculum change*
- *A dearth of opportunities for heads of department, deans of schools and faculties, and other senior staff, to develop their expertise in the management of courses and teaching."*

4.18 Several respondents felt there should be more emphasis on research methodology.

4.19 A number of respondents said that "gaps" were not the real issue. The fundamental problems were seen to be that the issues of pedagogical research and development are of marginal concern for most lecturers because there are no incentives in this area, no prestige associated with pedagogical development. A more cynical response was that engagement in this area was often just for the "look" of it to pass impending quality assessments.

4.20 More optimistic responses suggested that within some institutions this work was encouraged and valued but that there was a need for advice on publication channels for pedagogical developments. Also some institutions encourage secondments to educational development units and provide support for small research projects within disciplines. There is also a perceived need for more mentoring in this area of work and a proposal for all staff to create a professional development plan with a balanced proportion of teaching related goals.

What relationship between pedagogical development and pedagogical research would you favour? How does that compare with practice in your institution (organisation) and across the sector?

4.21 A strong response to this question was the need for more integration of pedagogical research and development within the disciplines because much of the generic work is considered too general to be applicable to particular disciplines.

There was strong support for encouraging lecturers to research their teaching and learning practice against a scholarly background and encouragement to publish their teaching and learning research, e.g.

"I would favour the approach where staff are supported to carry out pedagogical research through funding initiatives within or outwith institutions and then these staff having a responsibility for dissemination of their research for the development of others. Some professional societies have 'teaching" events at their national conferences and there should be more integration between pedagogical researchers and developers at these events. Similarly there could be more effort to include a greater number of discipline-based people at national development events".

4.22 Many respondents said that the research emphasis should not focus on quantitative methodology. There should be much more acknowledgement that pedagogy derives from disciplinary areas such as sociology, philosophy and psychology. Pedagogy is not an exact science. Institutions should encourage the "reflective practitioner ethos" throughout the institution. There is a perceived need for internal networking facilities for staff to share information in addition to external networks such as LTSN.

4.23 Most respondents would like to encourage a strong relationship and ensure that pedagogical research informs pedagogical development. At the moment there is perceived to be a lack of pedagogical research underpinning in many pedagogical developments.

4.24 Overall the responses indicated that there is good practice within some institutions but in general time and prestige for pedagogical development discouraged engagement.

<u>What staff development policies and strategies encourage integration between teaching and research and support the scholarship of teaching? Can you give examples?</u>

4.25 Many responses to this question tended to be somewhat negative and were a reinforcement of what was stated above as regards rewarding and valuing pedagogical research and development.

4.26 There is a strong perception that the RAE has encouraged a dissociation between research and scholarship; and that instead of polarising the RAE and QAA activities, there should be an inclusive approach which assesses departments or other groupings on their teaching, their research and the relationships between research, scholarship and teaching for mutual benefit.

4.27 Some people felt that promotion for "pedagogical excellence" would help, albeit that the interpretation of "excellence" is currently idiosyncratic. Teaching Fellowship Schemes were considered a positive development but there is still a gap between the rhetoric of valuing good teaching and the

reality. To be seen to be interested in teaching is seen as a sideways shift, not something to value.

4.28 There were mixed views on the role the ILT can play, and while the LTSN is not seen as having significant impact as yet, there is a feeling that once a critical mass of academics become involved this will be helpful.

4.29 Accredited CPD programmes for new lecturers are seen as a significant development because they implant the idea that teaching and learning are complex activities; but there is also a perception that even after completion of such programmes staff see their career in strongly subject-focused terms. The primary reasons for this are again lack of incentives, lack of promotion prospects based on teaching activities.

4.30 However, in addition to the above points which focus on lack of reward, a constructive approach to staff development is summed up in the following response:

"Clear links between academic practice and professional development, reward for good teaching and engaging in the scholarship of teaching and learning activities i.e. including it being a criteria for promotion and additional pay etc. Those with staff/professional development responsibilities being academics themselves and having academic practice experience. New approaches being developed re the promotion of learning related to academic practice, for academics. I'm not sure that we are applying best practice in the way that we are approaching staff development in many cases. In many universities I believe that two models probably co-exist alongside each other, one being driven by staff development officers and the other by educational development academics. Boundaries, approaches etc need to be articulated and changed where necessary".

Are you aware of any evaluation of such strategies? If so, what were the results of those evaluations?

4.31 A few respondents indicated that their institution was currently undertaking an evaluation of the success of the institutional learning and teaching strategy but that it was too soon to report. However most people were not aware of any major evaluation strategies of this scope.

4.32 Some people felt that evidence of change in culture is difficult to detect, others felt that in-house evaluation strategies were problematic and could have a negative effect. Others felt that evaluation is time consuming and expensive and that within HEIs there is a tendency to skimp on effective evaluation procedures.

4.33 There were some optimistic notes of individuals from within their disciplines presenting pedagogical work at conferences and having work in this area published. There was also mention of knowledge of evaluation strategies in Australian universities and Graham Gibbs' evaluation of the impact of initial

training. Also mentioned was evaluation of small scale funded projects, but respondents were not clear how these evaluations are disseminated.

How would you describe the quality and impact of the current state of scholarship of teaching?

4.34 Most responses said that the quality of much work in this area is very good and of international standard; some said the quality of work was poor. The impact of the work was seen to be low. The state and status of the scholarship of teaching is perceived to be poor but better than ten years ago: *"Growing, beginning to have impact, but not secure yet!"*

4.35 Teaching is generally perceived to be taken more seriously at institutional level but the focus is considered to be on teaching quality for the purposes of gaining good results in subject review. There were several responses which stated that work in this area is dependent on the enthusiasts, which again leads to low impact. Many people said that there is a huge body of work available, much of it of very high quality but that this body of work is largely ignored by disciplinary staff.

4.36 On the positive side, the networks such as ALT, ILT, LTSN, SEDA and funded projects such as FDTL were perceived to be beginning to change things, but very slowly. A few respondents said the state of the scholarship of teaching was at a potentially exciting stage and there was a growing awareness of its importance.

Responses to this question consistently indicated that the quality of much of the work was high but the impact was low.

How important is it for academic staff to research their teaching?

4.37 *"Very - how can you be a reflective practitioner if you don't collect the evidence on which to reflect? How often are our own perceptions of our teaching flawed?"*

4.38 Responses to this question fell into two main categories: those who said unequivocally that it is vital, or critically important and those who said it was important but expressed some misgivings about the expectation that all staff should research their teaching.

Many of those responses which fall into the second category, indicated that research was too wide a concept, and that reflection on practice or evaluation of practice was the important message to get across. Reflection is essential and its absence is unprofessional but it would be unrealistic to expect that everyone within an academic discipline should be undertaking pedagogical research and making original contributions.

4.39 The compromise solution appears to be that staff should be aware enough of the pedagogical research to question how that research informs their teaching, but that there should not be a minimalist interpretation of this, i.e. it

should not be considered by the funding bodies that an awareness of the pedagogical literature is sufficient.

Should such research receive parity of funding with other kinds of research?

4.40 The predominant response to this question was *"yes, at least as much funding"*. Researching our teaching was often cited as part of our core business (or should be) yet the proportion of funding available is minimal. A few respondents said that parity of funding might be too much to expect in the current climate but that it should at the very least have parity of esteem. Currently, pedagogical research is perceived as a second class activity.

What is the impact of the current funding regime on building capacity for scholarship of teaching and learning?

4.41 The strong response to this question is that the current funding regime is detrimental, destructive and discouraging, unhelpful and inadequate. The RAE is seen to carry a powerful and distorting message which undermines the value of pedagogical research and development.

"The funding regime has had a very negative impact as have the attitudes to this kind of research in higher education."

There is a perceived need to distinguish between funding for educationalists and for educators. Currently ESRC funding is entirely targeted to the former, not the latter. Schemes such as the TQEF and the NTF are seen as "a drop in the ocean".

Key themes

4.42 The key themes which emerged from the questionnaire responses are:

- The terms "pedagogical research and development" and the "scholarship of teaching" need to be more clearly defined beyond the level of educational developers.

- There is an increasing number and variety of development opportunities but a low demand because of the lack of esteem afforded such activities. Most of the development opportunities which are available are taken up by new staff.

- While there could be more emphasis on research methodology in this area, there are not so much gaps in professional development opportunities, as lack of time, motivation and reward for engaging in pedagogical research and development.

- A symbiotic relationship between pedagogical research and development is desirable and an emphasis on reflection on practice should be encouraged. There is a need for translation of generic research and development into disciplinary based terms.

- Accredited CPD programmes are a positive development, but staff development strategies are not in themselves enough to promote integration of pedagogical research and development. There has to be recognition of the value of pedagogical research and development. The RAE has a corrosive effect on scholarship.

- There is very little awareness of evaluation strategies which examine the integration of pedagogical research and development within UK HEIs.

- The scholarship of teaching is seriously undervalued. While a body of high quality work relating to teaching and learning is available, it has a very low impact because academic staff see their career in disciplinary based research terms.

- It is very important for staff to research their teaching but it would be unrealistic to expect all staff to make original contributions to research on teaching and learning. An ethos of reflection and critical evaluation should be encouraged.

- Pedagogical research should receive parity of funding and parity of esteem.

- The current funding regime with respect to pedagogical research is detrimental, discouraging, unhelpful and inadequate.

Chapter 5 Interviews with key stakeholders

To give a fair representation of the richness of views on the potential for building capacity for pedagogical research and development, the interview and questionnaire responses have been collated according to appropriate groupings.

Views of active pedagogical researchers

5.1 Telephone interviews were conducted with a number (5) of key players in the broad field of scholarship of teaching. The researchers gave in depth responses to the questions asked. Many of the views expressed were similar to those of the representatives of the major educational development networks.

5.2 Most of the interviewees understood PedD to mean: *"developing knowledge, ideas and skills as an educator, incorporating an understanding of learning, teaching (including assessment, curriculum development) and self assessment in to one's educational role and tasks."*

However, some of them indicated that this was not a term which is in common usage and would not necessarily be found in the literature and is therefore not well understood within the academic community. Despite these issues over definition of the term, the activities of pedagogical development were generally agreed to include; *"individual reading, thinking and experimenting, selection of and participation in institutional pedagogical development provision; exchange of ideas and practice with colleagues, either informally or formally (e.g. in departmental development sessions; mentoring activities, participating in intra- institutional or disciplinary networks for developing one's capacity as an educator)".*

5.3 The scholarship of teaching is seen as a problematic activity which requires *"deep thinking as with any other discipline. It requires logic and argument and evidence, building on literature and theory. It is a more conscious and explicit knowledge of practice."*

5.4 While there was agreement that various opportunities are provided within institutions for staff to engage in pedagogical research and development, the uptake of these opportunities is hampered by the focus on the RAE. Time, resources and perception of need for pedagogical research were also seen as factors which militate against sustainable staff development policies which promote the scholarship of teaching. The lasting influence of the Enterprise Higher Education Initiative was mentioned, as was the work of national networks such as SRHE, SEDA and ILT. While induction programmes and postgraduate certificate programmes were cited as a positive development, there was also mention that much of the pedagogical development opportunities are aimed at new staff, with few experienced staff having much familiarity with pedagogical literature.

5.5 A common theme regarding what relationship there should be between PedR and PedD was that there is a symbiotic and cyclical relationship between the

two, with research leading into development, and development leading into practice.

5.6 The responses of this group indicate that to develop effective strategies to promote the scholarship of teaching requires first of all a recognition that both research and teaching are problematic issues, and a clarification of the definition of the terms research and teaching. Staff development policies were seen to be ambiguous in this respect and thus it is not clear what is being implemented. It was considered that at a profound professional level, there has been very little evaluation of staff development policies regarding the scholarship of teaching, although the evaluations of FDTL and TLTP were mentioned.

5.7 The quality and impact of the current state of the scholarship of teaching is generally perceived to be low, and again it was considered that this is due to the long established culture in academia of not valuing pedagogy. However despite the general lack of quality and impact it was also noted that, for a select group of people in HE, scholarship of teaching has been researched at a high level of understanding and is international in scope. *"There is a rich literature that has been teased out but there is little engagement in the UK by senior management staff on these issues."*

5.8 Thoughts on the importance of academic staff researching their own teaching varied from the viewpoint that it is absolutely vital, to the view that this should be seen as a continuum which is vital to the improvement of teaching. While action research should be encouraged it is unrealistic to expect everybody to publish on the scholarship of teaching.

5.9 The predominant view on the issue of funding is that pedagogical research should have special treatment, and that it is not appropriate to provide funding in a competitive manner because *"it is unacceptable for disciplinary staff to not research the pedagogy of that discipline"*.

5.10 There was a unanimous view that the current funding regime devalues PedR. All rewards lie on the side of traditional research. It was stated that *"building capacity of research is quite deliberate because it gives us international standing. It is not the same for teaching. There is nothing to encourage and no resources to pay for, pedagogical research and development."*

UK-wide networks

5.11 Interviews were conducted with representatives of a number of major UK-wide networks whose remit is to promote pedagogical research and development. These included SEDA, ILT, LTSN.

5.12 While the general view from the networks is that pedagogical development involves the development of skills, perceptions and understandings of how people learn, and what teaching methods enhance student learning, it was thought that the definition might depend on who is doing it. Pedagogical development is occurring all the time within the

disciplines, through staff engaging in curriculum development and course design, but a wider view of pedagogical development is: "*people in their disciplines being supported in understanding the 'processes' of teaching and learning*".

5.13 Pedagogical research is described as research-led teaching and learning, in the sense of teaching being underpinned and informed by educational research. The best research is seen as action research projects carried out in the classroom.

5.14 A range of views were expressed regarding the definition of the scholarship of teaching. Scholarship may be defined as the need for academics to know about educational and pedagogical theory. However there is a perceived problem over academics' and funding councils' views of pedagogical research. There is a belief that pedagogical research fits within a traditional, scientific, quantitative paradigm, whereas it was argued that it draws from the qualitative paradigms of psychology, sociology and philosophy. This, it was argued, leads to a negative perception of the value of pedagogical research and scholarship.

5.15 An interesting view was expressed that scholars are different from excellent researchers.

"Scholars are good integrators who put together perspectives and communicate them well. Researchers are narrower and deeper; scholars must be wider and go for essential questions. While researchers often pursue the next piece of a jigsaw, scholars solve the jigsaw and make sense of it."

5.16 Another interesting observation was that:

"*The distinctions between the terms pedagogical development, pedagogical research and the scholarship of teaching are essentially made by funding arrangements rather than corresponding to any intellectual coherent framework.*"

5.17 While all respondents agreed that there is in fact a lot happening, one view was that it is not always well co-ordinated and coherent. While accessing funding was seen as a problem, in-house postgraduate courses are now believed to be encouraging staff to see themselves as supporters or facilitators of learning. Such courses and other staff development opportunities are enabling a staged process of development from raising awareness of teaching and learning issues, through to development of student centred models of teaching. Action research projects are increasing and the Teaching Fellowship scheme is a motivator. However, these opportunities are still seen to be reaching only a small proportion of academic staff.

5.18 Although the ILT and the LTSN are perceived to be positive developments, there are also seen to be major gaps in development opportunities. The primary ones are the lack of empowerment for staff to engage in scholarship

of teaching, the lack of centres of excellence in pedagogical research, and the lack of funding for studentships in pedagogical research.

5.19 While the issue of academics engaging in pedagogical research within their disciplines is seen as very important there does seem to be a need to clarify the terms to promote engagement. To resolve some of these issues requires:

"an integrated human resource management strategy, effective promotion and reward strategies and a compulsory element in people's career development plans relating to the scholarship of teaching. Educational development units should not just be seen as support units but should be staffed by academics and scholars who are engaging effectively with disciplinary based staff."

5.20 Apart from in-house evaluations and the beginnings of teaching and learning strategy evaluations, there appears to be little knowledge of major evaluations of the scholarship of teaching.

5.21 Current research in this area of scholarship and teaching is seen to be patchy in quality, and to some extent this poor quality is perceived to be due to lack of clarification of the appropriate research paradigm. Impact is low in accordance with the small numbers of people engaging in this type of research. A difficulty is perceived in terms of the accessibility, to people working within their disciplines, of the quality research of Ramsden, Biggs, Martin, Laurillard etc. There is a need for translation of such research into relevant terms for disciplinary based staff.

5.22 All contributors felt it was important for academic staff to research their teaching at some level and that at the very minimum they should be reflecting on and reviewing their teaching strategies.

5.23 The issue of parity of funding is not seen as a straightforward issue by any of the respondents. It is not enough to fund pedagogical research as another discipline. Pedagogical research and development constitute a major part of the core business of HE and as such they should be invested in properly. Current funding is seen as only marginally better than ten years ago and is still constraining people's willingness to engage.

National projects

5.24 Within the time frame of the project, efforts were made to contact and interview representatives of some of the major UK-wide projects and initiatives with an interest and involvement in promoting enhancement of learning strategies. In the event, views were obtained from representatives of 3 key projects, JISC, SKILL: the National Bureau for Students with Disabilities, and the HEFCE's National Co-ordination Team (NCT).

5.25 The responses of the group of representatives regarding issues of pedagogical research, development and the scholarship of teaching largely iterated the definition expressed by other groupings, although it was clear that

not everyone was familiar with the term scholarship of teaching. Not surprisingly, an additional viewpoint expressed was that:

"Little attention is focused on academics understanding the learning needs associated with disability, for example, how does learning occur when interpreters are present for students with hearing impairments?"

5.26 There were questions raised in terms of the underlying assumptions regarding supporting and enabling learning.

5.27 All respondents were in agreement that there are a lot of opportunities for staff to engage in pedagogical research, but that it is support for staff which is lacking – in terms of time, resources and recognition for this work. Having the opportunities is not the same as encouraging people to engage with them, so it tends to be enthusiasts who take up the opportunities.

5.28 It was noted that no serious research has been undertaken relating to disability and learning. There is also perceived to be a lack of a transparent and resourced CPD framework for academic staff. It was also mentioned that there is insufficient focus on the impact of new technologies on teaching and how the use of technology is integrated with traditional teaching methods.

5.29 There was a strong agreement that there should be an iterative relationship between pedagogical research and development, but to effect this across the institution goes well beyond the provision of staff development opportunities, it is seen to be more about strategic resource management. It was suggested that few academic staff are employed on the basis of what they are doing to improve pedagogical practice. Recruitment policies should reflect the importance of pedagogical development, and staff development policies should take appropriate actions to recognise the QAA Code of Practice relating to disability and the changing disability legislation.

5.30 In common with the response of most other groups interviewed, there was very little awareness of any evaluation of staff development policies.

5.31 Not all of the respondents had a strong view about the quality and impact of the scholarship of teaching but expected that impact was quite low. They also agreed on the high importance which should be placed on scholarship and reflection on learning and the desirability for staff to be engaged in researching their teaching.

5.32 Two of the respondents felt that pedagogical research should receive parity of funding, but suggested that the issue is about much more than funding – parity of esteem, appropriate resource management strategies, etc. One of the respondents felt that funding was not required because it is part of the job of academic staff. All were agreed that the current funding regime and the impact of the RAE discourage scholarship of teaching. While the TQEF is funding capacity-building in this area this is not seen as nearly enough input.

National Teaching Fellows

5.33 Three interviews were conducted with National Teaching Fellows which give a view from the "disciplines" on the scholarship of teaching. Each of the interviewees gave broadly similar definitions of pedagogical development and expressed this term in relation to *"ways in which lecturers develop themselves and others to deliver learning teaching and assessment and explore the methods which enable students to learn within the disciplines"*. Pedagogical research is described as *"proper academic research, collecting data about the effectiveness of teaching techniques to get a sense of outcomes, whereas pedagogical development is more impressionistic and informal"*.

5.34 The scholarship of teaching is not a term with which any of the National Teaching Fellows felt comfortable and they questioned whether it meant the scholarship of what is being achieved or how it is delivered, whether it was being used as an umbrella term for appropriate teaching and research, *"being used by people trying to be taken seriously to get funding"*.

5.35 Views differed slightly as to the opportunities available to engage in pedagogical development and the gaps in provision. On the one hand the perception of opportunity seemed to depend on the nature of the discipline, while on the other hand there was a view that development opportunities had mushroomed and that compulsory postgraduate programmes had had a positive impact. For people working within their disciplines, it was considered problematic to access appropriate conferences because of financial constraints and, in one case, because of a perception that *"you have to be an expert to have a paper accepted for educational development conferences"*.

5.36 The National Teaching Fellows felt that research and development should be linked but that there needs to be more emphasis put on disciplinary based pedagogy. While generalised staff development opportunities are fine, encouragement of reflection on one's own performance and professional development is the ethos which should be encouraged.

5.37 While it is thought that the influence of programmes such as FDTL and initiatives such as the ILT are beginning to impact positively, the quality and impact of the current state of scholarship of teaching are seen to be low, and this may be exacerbated by lack of a clear definition of what "the scholarship of teaching" actually means. Because it is not rewarded or valued, research into one's teaching practice is highly desirable but not prioritised by many academics.

5.38 The lack of parity of teaching research is problematic and leads to lack of encouragement for staff to engage. RAE panels should give parity to research into teaching and research into the subject, which would lead to equality of esteem.

5.39 The current funding regime is seen as divisive with the only money for researching pedagogy being perceived as associated directly with HEFCE projects such as FDTL.

View from a university and college lecturers' union

5.40 Within the given time frame it was possible to interview a representative from only one of the higher education unions[SHOULD SAY WHICH ONE]. While it is not clear that the views of other unions would be similar, the interview highlights issues which have not been stated elsewhere.

5.41 The view expressed is that in practice pedagogical development, pedagogical research and scholarship represent a spectrum, rather than three distinct areas of activity. It would understand pedagogical development as encompassing the full range of teaching-related CPD, whereas the scholarship of teaching might encompass the more personal, reflective end of the spectrum, and include academic study:

Pedagogical development is seen to include a range of generic activities, including formal workshops, courses, seminars and conferences, in matters relating directly to teaching and the support of learning, and also to relevant skills such as C&IT skills. Also included would be subject and departmental forms of support such as mentoring, peer observation, peer review and discussion, and opportunities to review and plan with colleagues on a structured basis.

Potentially it would also include opportunities to be involved in debate on teaching and learning strategies and related changes such as use of C&IT, widening participation, and supporting students with diverse needs. It would involve staff in developing pedagogy in their areas as well as "being developed", by being an active part of how changes in teaching strategies and support evolve at the organisational level.

5.42 Pedagogical research was viewed as a more systematic extension of much of this activity, being published (in some form), disseminated to others, and based on systematic enquiry. It includes both generic research into teaching and learning, and subject-specific research into the way different information, knowledge, forms of enquiry etc are taught and learned.

5.43 It was recognised that most institutions offer generic staff development events and workshops but where take up is voluntary there may be an inevitable degree of "self-selection" by enthusiasts. Opportunities may be offered in relation to innovations, such as the use of new technologies, but not in relation to the development and improvement of core teaching activities.

5.44 Activities such as internal subject review and courses proposals also function as development activities, as do informal and regular engagement in activities such as course and module review, staff-student liaison, external examining and course team preparation. Other forms of support at this level include appraisal outcomes, peer observation and mentoring.

5.45 From the viewpoint of this staff union the group of staff least likely to benefit from generic or subject level pedagogical development is:

"hourly paid and fixed term staff, notwithstanding the level of contribution to teaching made by them. Institutions may make generic staff development opportunities available to part timers in theory, but tend not to pay for attendance or to publicise opportunities widely. Involvement in departmental or subject level activity is even less likely."

5.46 With respect to the relationship between pedagogical research and development, the union representative believed that there should be scope for those who develop a particular interest in the scholarship of their teaching to develop opportunities for PedR, possibly on a seconded, fixed term basis. Funding should allow for specifically defined posts within departments, for individuals to engage in teaching leadership and PedR, such as "teaching fellows". RAE recognition for activities such as text book production would also support staff in developing from one part of the spectrum to the other.

5.47 As with most other stakeholders the union believes that pedagogical research should receive parity of funding.

5.48 With respect to the issue of academic staff researching their own teaching:

"Our members describe frustration at having inadequate time to reflect on and evaluate teaching, especially in any structured or shared sense ... This is not helped by the fact that it may often be perceived as invisible work, with little value or kudos."

5.49 An optimistic view was held of the role to be played by the ILT and LTSN subject centres, but the union believes that much of the pedagogical research currently available is at a general/generic level rather than subject specific.

5.50 It feels that all academic staff should have the opportunity to benefit from PedR done by others, both in their field and generically. In the current climate many staff simply do not have the resources to research their own teaching, nor to share their teaching successes and developments with others - which is a real loss to students in the system.

5.51 The view on the impact of the current funding regime on building capacity for scholarship of teaching and learning is that funding should be available on an equal footing for research into teaching, and that arguably if this was the case then attitudes towards teaching might shift overall – not just in relation to the individuals carrying out research.

"Until the funding regime recognises the very different staffing and funding pressures experienced in those departments and institutions where very small amounts of research funding are forthcoming, then staff particularly in the post-92 institutions will be at a significant disadvantage. This is the case to an even greater degree for those delivering HE courses in FE colleges."

Views of the representative bodies for UK higher education

5.52 Telephone interviews were conducted with representatives from Universities UK and Universities Scotland. In terms of their views on the definitions of pedagogical development, pedagogical research and the scholarship of teaching, they differed little from those previously described in this chapter. However for understandable reasons, they were less well placed to know of opportunities for staff to engage in these activities. They tended to assume that the "scholarship of teaching" happens in institutions but did also recognise that time and money were major factors relating to engagement.

5.53 In common with the views of others, both respondents expressed the importance of teaching being informed by subject research and pedagogical research but did also recognise that there may be a need for "an intermediate layer of activity", interpreting pedagogical research for practitioners in the disciplines.

5.54 Lack of resource for good teaching and the scholarship of learning was something which the respondents believed must be addressed regarding strategies which would support the integration of pedagogical research, development and scholarship. Although neither interviewee commented on the quality of the current state of the scholarship of teaching, both felt that the impact was low, and to engage staff in pedagogical research, there needs to be a clearer definition of what that means.

5.55 While both appreciated that the scholarship of teaching lacks esteem, which is in fact necessary to get results appreciated and properly influenced by available resources, and that the current funding regime is discouraging, parity in terms of funding is not seen as a simplistic issue.

Research Councils

5.56 Three of the seven research councils were contacted and there was sufficient consistency in their response to suggest that others might take up a similar position in relation to pedagogical development, research and the scholarship of teaching.

5.57 None of the Councils' representatives appeared to be familiar with the term "scholarship of teaching", and all stated clearly that pedagogical development was not part of their remit. They variously said that it was either the responsibility of teaching departments, institutions or the funding bodies. However, they all expressed an interest in the quality of teaching and had produced guidelines to teaching departments on postgraduate teaching and PhD supervision. There are processes in place to give accreditation to departments to undertake PhD supervision but it was made clear that little attention was focused on teaching methods or professional development. As one respondent said *"we are silent on methods of teaching"* and, as another said, *"we are interested in the results rather than means of achieving them"*.

5.58 One representative was particularly keen to emphasise the importance of undergraduate teaching, because of the way it can influence good undergraduates to go into postgraduate research. In his view, undergraduate teaching needs to be "inspirational" to encourage good students to be enthused about undertaking research. Good teaching, he thought, is best undertaken by those people doing leading edge research who can "create a buzz" in their teaching which communicates the excitement of research to undergraduates. However, he acknowledged that not all good researchers are good teachers and nor are good teachers necessarily good researchers.

5.59 Despite their concern that teaching quality should be improved, the Research Council representatives all argued that their remit is to fund large-scale generally applicable research rather than small-scale professional development. However, they all said that they had an open policy about considering research proposals and that if they were to receive projects relating to improving teaching within their subject areas, they would be considered and put to peer review. They also acknowledged that they could not remember ever receiving such proposals.

Some ESRC-funded research projects

5.60 The ESRC has funded some recent projects that are relevant to this discussion. One example is a study by Skelton and Higgins into understanding teaching excellence. That project seeks to build upon the HEFCE evaluation of the first year of the National Teaching Fellowships. Through interviews, documentary and press coverage analysis, the project is designed to: investigate NTF award winners' understandings of teaching excellence; compare the NTF scheme with other awards schemes; explore the implications for the professional identity of recipients; consider how the NTF scheme seeks to raise the profile of teaching and learning in higher education, including how it is reported in the educational press.

5.61 Another example is the study into enhancing teaching and learning environments in undergraduate courses, which is part of the ESRC Teaching and Learning Research Programme (TLRP). This four-year project, which started in January 2001, plans to develop subject-specific conceptual frameworks to inform the development, at various levels, of teaching and learning environments. The research will focus upon five subject areas (electronic engineering, cellular biology, business economics, history, and media and communication studies). Initially the project has concentrated upon two principal areas of work: a literature review, and initial interviews which will be used to inform the conceptual frameworks for the study and piloting of instruments that will access the perceptions which staff and students hold of teaching and learning environments and approaches to studying. The substantiative research occurs in 2002 and 2003. In addition to detailed studies based upon questionnaires and interviews, the researchers also plan to explore how learning outcomes could be enhanced. One intended outcome is the creation of validated instruments which can be used by course organisers and module leaders in self review. Another objective for the final phase in 2004 is an investigation of ways of encouraging pedagogical change,

again based upon studies conducted in the participating institutions (primarily the Universities of Edinburgh, Durham and Coventry).

5.62 The study by Zukas and Malcolm (see Chapter 2) was also funded by ESRC.

5.63 The third round of the TLRP will concentrate on post-compulsory education and may provide more opportunities for relevant research - although this will be at the research (rather than development) end of the spectrum. Because TLRP is concerned with impact on practitioners, it will be expected that the TLRP-funded research should have impact on the skill development of higher education teaching. Although TLRP will encourage more research in pedagogical areas, in general, the ESRC does not claim to have a strong interest in this area.

5.64 Another theme emerging from the interviews with representatives of three Research Councils was a concern with the need to improve the research skills of academic staff. In particular, the ESRC had concerns about shortcomings in quantitative research skills. It wants to promote skill development in this area and this does have implications for individual staff development. The postgraduate training requirements for the new generation of social science researchers places greater emphasis on quantitative skills. This is part of an attempt at up-skilling the existing academic community to address the current concerns about the gaps in the understanding of quantitative methods.

5.65 It might be argued that the failure of much current pedagogical research to achieve recognition, and consequently funding, was because of these perceived short-comings in quantitative research skills. If the ESRC primarily operates with a model of research which seeks to encourage more large scale, generally applicable, theoretically grounded, methodologically robust, and possibly quantitative, research – and most of the current pedagogical research uses a different paradigm – it would follow that ESRC might not attach a high priority to this work.

The higher education funding bodies

5.66 Within the time frame of the project it proved possible to obtain the views of representatives from only two of the funding bodies. While there were no major differences in the responses, there was a difference in emphasis regarding some of the questions relating to the issue of building capacity for research on the scholarship of teaching.

5.67 In general terms the funding council representatives viewed pedagogical development as the "science or philosophy of the teaching process", finding better ways to deliver on student learning and teaching practice. This included keeping up with innovations using technology etc. Pedagogical research is about questioning the effectiveness of teaching and learning strategies, but it lacks status and the current research is seen to be of poor quality. The scholarship of teaching distinguishes between satisfactory and excellent teaching and is about studying classroom behaviours and interactions with students.

5.68 Opportunities to engage in pedagogical development are known to exist and might include participating on a subject basis through the LTSN, institutional staff development provision, and discussions at departmental and institutional levels. There is a general impression that some excellent things are being done within institutions but that there is a need for more time to be devoted to learning and teaching strategies to improve methods of teaching. There is recognition that there should be a symbiotic link between research and development and research informing practice, but also that the research must be motivated by the researcher's curiosity.

5.69 The funding bodies' representatives were not aware of significant evaluation of pedagogical research and development strategies. They felt that the quality and impact of scholarship of teaching is patchy and has not resulted in teaching having a high profile in higher education. It is still cutting edge research and working with industry that attract popular press.

5.70 From a funding body point of view it may not be necessary for all academics to research their own area, but peer group prestige, knowledge of good quality work by colleagues and an underpinning ethos of reflection could promote effective teaching practice.

5.71 Although it is recognised that the current funding regime promotes the status quo with respect to the scholarship of teaching, and that in principle there should be parity of funding for the pedagogical and traditional research, there were mixed views as to whether there should be additional funding provided for this area of work.

Predominant messages from the stakeholder interviews

5.72 Clearer definition of the terms scholarship of teaching, pedagogical development and pedagogical research and their inter-relationships is required to promote engagement, particularly at the level of the disciplines.

5.73 Despite the issues associated with terminology there is widespread agreement that pedagogical development activities include: developing knowledge, ideas and skills as an educator, understanding teaching and learning, engaging with pedagogical literature, experimenting in the classroom, participating in appropriate staff development provision, mentoring, exchanging ideas and practice.

5.74 While there is knowledge of wide ranging opportunities for staff to engage in pedagogical development opportunities, it is believed that these opportunities are not necessarily co-ordinated and coherent. Gaps in provision exist for experienced staff members because the focus of activities tends to be targeted at probationary staff.

5.75 At disciplinary level, opportunities to attend relevant conferences, lack of time and resources, the pressure of and emphasis on the RAE and the lack of

parity of esteem for pedagogical development, are all factors which militate against an emphasis on the scholarship of teaching.

5.76 The issue of exploring and understanding of the needs of disabled students is generally absent in pedagogical development opportunities. This matter is further highlighted by the fact that it was raised by only one of the interviewees, who is a representative of one of the major national projects specifically supporting disabled students.

5.77 There is a general view that initiatives such as the NTFS, FDTL, LTSN, ILT, SRHE, and SEDA are having a positive impact in promoting the scholarship of teaching. However, it is still felt that the quality of much work in this field is patchy and that the impact is variable, and difficult to identify and measure.

5.78 While most of the interviewees felt that there is a strong need to encourage staff to research the pedagogy of their disciplines, there is also a need for clarification of expectation. It is thought likely that it is unrealistic to expect all staff to contribute to the original conceptual and theoretical literature. However, action research within the disciplines should be encouraged.

5.79 While some respondents felt that it is obvious that pedagogical research should receive parity of funding, others felt that the issue is much more complex than that. There should be parity of esteem, adequate resources and an ethos of scholarship in teaching which is reflected in recruitment and promotion policies. The Research Councils, while obviously having an interest in the quality of teaching and hence the quality of postgraduate students, did not see funding of scholarship as being within their remit.

5.80 There is ample scope for building capacity in the scholarship of teaching but to achieve this requires sustainable strategic staff development policies which place an appropriate emphasis on scholarship, clarity of terminology, parity of esteem for scholarship and a strategic policy as regards provision of funding.

Chapter 6 Summary and issues for capacity building

6.1 This chapter summaries the findings of this study by linking them to the six aims of the research, noted in 1.3 above. It begins with an overview summary of the main conclusions. This is followed by the summaries of each of the aims.

Summary conclusions

6.2 The survey of UK-based interviewees revealed not only that, although not necessarily familiar with the term, they could articulate a working definition of pedagogical development, but that there was a substantial degree of overlap between definitions.

6.3 A wider range of understandings occurred for pedagogical research.

6.4 There was some confusion over the meaning of the scholarship of teaching and, particularly, of how that concept related to PedD and PedR. Some respondents who might be considered to be successful practitioners, measured by awards of FDTL projects or NTF awards, viewed the term scholarship of teaching with some suspicion – another piece of educational development jargon.

6.5 Generally respondents identified PedD as improving teaching and promoting more effective learning. There was also widespread agreement that such development must be informed by evaluation, reflection and consideration of the literature and research findings.

6.6 PedR involved researching these issues. The differences in opinion primarily reflected views on the appropriate methodologies for such research, and the extent to which respondents expected researchers to connect directly with improving practice. Views also varied on the current capacity for, scale and quality of PedR.

6.7 The scholarship of teaching and learning was seen as overlapping with PedD and PedR. The scholarly dimension shaded towards research but generally the scholarship of teaching and learning was seen as having a developmental, and hence shared and peer reviewed, focus.

6.8 We have explored ways of defining PedD and PedR in Chapter 1, and throughout this study we have repeatedly returned to the complex understandings of, and relationships between, these concepts. It might be misleading to represent the three terms as arranged along a continuum. A more appropriate analogy may be one of partially overlapping sets of activities within the developmental "space" of teaching and learning in higher education.

6.9 Many interviewees said they were awaiting the outcome of the 2001 RAE with interest, to see if subject panels rewarded PedR.

Issues for capacity building

Aim (a): identify what processes are currently available which allow staff to engage in PedD

6.10 The awareness of opportunities available to staff ranged substantially. In part there was a strong correlation with role and involvement. Sometimes those who were detached from the immediate action, offered suppositional pictures, with varying degrees of certainty and currency. In contrast it appeared from the data that those who were most closely involved as researchers or practitioners have greater awareness of opportunities. The case-studies give powerful, and in several aspects encouraging examples, although they also identified challenges and obstacles.

6.11 Many respondents from HEIs were enthusiastic about the potential for the development of postgraduate programmes for teaching staff. Generally respondents in the survey and interviews were cautiously hopeful about the contribution which ILT could make to advancing PedD and the scholarship of teaching, and contributing to conversations and understandings about effective teaching and learning.

6.12 The potential of LTSN was also mentioned. Respondents did not specifically refer to the small scale research projects for which subject centres can seek LTSN support, nor did they mention the LTSN response to the HEFCE Review of Research which emphasised the scholarship underpinning learning and teaching. Rather we appeared to be receiving sentiments of hopeful expectation. Many respondents indicated, or implied, that it was too early to pass a judgement on achievements or impact. The recent establishment by the ILT and LTSN of publications offers new outlets for work on PedD and PedR.

Aim (b): identify any mechanisms within these processes by which academic staff can progress from pedagogical development (PedD) to pedagogical research (PedR)

6.13 Those involved in discipline-based projects or responding from that perspective tended to favour the connection to their own academic culture, and occasionally queried the efficacy of broader, over-arching approaches. Interestingly NTF award holders held similar views, even though these are personal awards.

6.14 Whilst the questions did not necessarily trigger substantial discussions of institutional learning and teaching strategies, it might have been anticipated that this would have been an obvious touchstone. Generally that happened less frequently or widely than might have been expected, although many detailed institutional illustrations may derive directly from these strategies. However the team members were also involved in the evaluation of TQEF which identified more powerful institutional influences.

6.15 There was a substantial degree of consensus, from virtually every quarter, that PedD should be accorded greater esteem. Therefore interviewees agreed that PedD should receive greater parity with research. Generally most also believed that high-quality PedR should be given proper esteem within the research environment, and greater recognition than is accorded presently.

Aim (c): identify any gaps within current provision of academic staff development with regard to pedagogical development (PedD)

6.16 A similar range characterised views on gaps in developmental support, although there was a high degree of consensus that progress had been made but that more needed to be done.

6.17 Many respondents had limited knowledge of evaluations, local or national, of staff development policies. They were also unclear about the role of some agencies or of the relationships between agencies/organisations.

6.18 There was a high degree of consensus that the current funding regime was not adequately promoting PedD or scholarship of teaching and learning.

6.19 When taken alongside the work which is being progressed within institutional learning and teaching strategies, and the wide array of other initiatives and opportunities mentioned elsewhere in this report, these are grounds for some optimism. There is certainly a basis for concluding that quite a lot is happening. However, several challenges remain. It is difficult to calibrate them precisely, partly because of their complexity but primarily due to the paucity of reliable comprehensive data. Nonetheless the principal areas are:

- Doubts about the scope and extent of impact, involvement, adoption, adaptation and embedding at a variety of levels from individual practitioners, to disciplines to institutions, and to the sector as a whole
- Difficulties in progressing beyond the cohort of enthusiasts (early adopters) and particular target groups such as new academic staff
- Issues surrounding understandings of the relevant concepts, and their relationship to the discourses of different disciplines and the subtle 'invisible' cultures of different institutions
- Tendencies to polarise options, actions, policies and strategies as if this was invariably a matter of competing choices. Whereas much of the thrust of recent policy study research tends to emphasise sense-making in complex, fluid multi-faceted cultural situations and environments, which may be more suited to sophisticated, differentiated, even eclectic, multi-stranded frameworks and strategies, each contributing to the attainment of the broader objectives and priorities.

6.20 For example, membership of ILT is growing. The emergence across the system of programmes to enable new teaching staff to gain membership through accredited routes indicates that further increases will occur. However, on the current trajectory it could be some time before the majority of teaching staff are members. The ILT is contributing to capacity building both

through the promotion of professional standards and by encouraging innovation, the exchange of views and experiences and scholarship.

6.21 The survey indicates that few may have a sound, up-to-date map (knowledge) of what is happening. Most teaching staff probably have at best a narrow and limited map. More problematic are the findings of distinguished policy researchers such as Kogan that many academics do not attach priority to gaining such knowledge – a rather fundamental impediment to capacity building.

Aim (d): identifying issues in addressing the gaps

6.22 The overwhelming majority of interviewees wanted all teaching staff to be actively engaged in pedagogical development. In order to do so effectively it was expected that staff would be knowledgeable both about needs and about the messages from recent research. Few considered that most teaching staff should undertake major pedagogical research. Indeed some expressed the view that academics are discouraged to do so, for fear that *"it is the end of their academic career"*. Moreover the literature review undertaken, while limited in scope, suggested that the refereed publications from some LTSN subject centres offers new opportunities. Most respondents considered that teaching staff should actively evaluate and reflect on their teaching, which could, of course, include action research.

6.23 Most respondents found it difficult to benchmark against other institutions or provision or to comment broadly, i.e. take a sector-wide view. Indeed many found it difficult to take broader perspectives, i.e. to go beyond their own direct locus of action and knowledge. That may appear natural, in that researchers do not know everything, but they are expected to be extremely knowledgeable about their field of research. The implications may be narrower fields in relation to teaching and learning than some of the literature might presume. If so, it would have significant implications for capacity building.

6.24 Whilst undue confusion over the meaning of key concepts is unhelpful, complete unanimity may be improbable, certainly in the short-term. Nor would that necessarily be the most productive way forward. A more fruitful avenue might involve a need for a subtle but important shift in academic cultures. This would not only give greater attention to pedagogical development and the scholarship of teaching, but honour such discourses and expect them to be an integral part of the functioning of the academy, institutions and disciplines. Whilst research quickly becomes global and cosmopolitan, much of the traditions in teaching and learning remain individualistic, local and localised. If that assertion has some validity then making progress will require greater attention to these issues, including effectively utilising the local and localised orientations and preferences.

6.25 The survey, and other sources of information, indicate that there is a substantial volume of activity, especially in relation to PedD. Each funding body has its own distinctive raft of initiatives. Further there is the work of ILT, LTSN and JISC, the endeavours of organisations such as SRHE, SEDA and

HEDG, the ESRC TLRP programme, the QAA reviews, and the programmes and initiatives within institutions. In aggregate that represents a substantial thrust for capacity building. Indeed our knowledge of the international scene indicates that the UK is seen as performing at, or close to, the leading edge. Maximising the potential is the challenge.

Aim (e): issues in supporting and promoting scholarship

6.26 Understandably PedD views differed. For example the Research Councils believed that responsibility primarily lay with the funding bodies and institutions. The funding bodies took the view that it was primarily for institutions to use the funds allocated to deliver priorities, by implication if PedD and scholarship of teaching are a priority, allocate internally accordingly. The funding bodies, and indeed many other stakeholders, hoped that agencies such as ILT and LTSN would contribute significantly to capacity building in relation to PedD and scholarship of teaching. Most active researchers hoped that ESRC TLRP3 might more actively support PedR and inform PedD and were disappointed with progress to date.

6.27 We believe that the Review highlights several key areas for consideration, namely:

- Connectivity
- Dissemination
- Further promotion of innovation
- Addressing reward, recognition and esteem
- Promoting debate on PedD and scholarship of teaching
- Ensuring the high quality PedR is conducted and rewarded and used to inform PedD
- Promoting an enhancement culture (and probably adjusting the balance from assurance to enhancement)
- Seeking to address the local and cosmopolitan dimensions, individual and departmental, disciplinary and institutional.

6.28 More could be done about dissemination but, if the arguments in 6.21 (and elsewhere in this Report) have reasonable validity, the principal target may be that of changing the culture. Here it would seem that the connection to institutional learning and teaching strategies may be fundamental. There may be an argument for sharpening the focus upon the ways in which PedD and scholarship of teaching and learning inform action plans, how PedR integrates into practice, and a quality enhancement strategy that underpins the learning and teaching strategy.

6.29 Reward and recognition were recurrent issues amongst respondents, so extensive and intrinsic motivators are key issues which affect deliberations at various scales and by several stakeholders. Again progress is being made, although few within the system may have sufficiently comprehensive and comparative up-to-date knowledge. The fact that innovation does take place may indicate that the climate is certainly not hostile. However, many responses sought a more explicitly supportive climate and stated that action

was needed by several stakeholders on a range of issues surrounding reward and recognition (e.g. finance, time, esteem, promotion, support, and resources).

6.30 The survey demonstrated support for the promotion of, and active engagement with, PedD by all teaching staff. Engaging busy experienced staff is a significant challenge. Additional sensitivity is needed over sub-cultures and missions. Yet, it can be argued that the development of the ILT and other initiatives, including several supported by the funding bodies, is creating a climate of encouragement. If so then the crucial issues may be alignment, involvement and seeking synergy and connectivity.

Aim (f): identify areas of good practice, such as examples of staff development policies that encourage an integrated approach to the development of the teacher/researcher in higher education, and support the scholarship of teaching

6.31 The case studies reveal significant levels of supportive activity within that sample of institutions, particularly for new staff and through various ways of enabling experienced staff to develop contributions to PedD and the scholarship of teaching. Some central units have also been specifically charged with making active contributions to these fields and to PedR, presumably to model development, provide local expertise, enhance credibility, attract and retain suitably qualified staff and contribute to institutional priorities for capacity building and change.

Appendix 1

Bibliography

Adams, J.S. and Mercer, J. (1994) Reconsidering Faculty Roles and Rewards in Geography, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, Vol. 18, No.1: 7-18.

Andresen, L. W. (2000) A Useable, Trans-disciplinary Conception of Scholarship, *Higher Education Research & Development*, Vol. 19, No.2: 137-153.

Andresen, L.W. and Webb, C.A. (2000) Discovering the Scholarship of Teaching. Unpublished report: University of Western Sydney Hawkesbury.

AUT (2001) *Building the Academic Team: a report on the contribution of academic related staff to the delivery of higher education* London:AUT

Badley, G. (2001) Towards a pragmatic scholarship of academic development, *Quality Assurance in Education* Vol. 9, No.3: 162-170.

Ballantyne, R., Bain, J.D. and Packer, J. (1999) Researching University Teaching in Australia: themes and issues in academics' reflections, *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 24, No. 2: 237-257.

Barnett, R. (2000) *Realising the University in an Age of Supercomplexity.* Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education.

Becher, T. (1994) The Significance of Disciplinary Differences, *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol.19, No.2:151-161.

Becher, T. and Trowler, P.R (2001) *Academic Tribes and Territories* 2nd Edition, Buckingham: SRHE/OUP.

Beetham, H. et al (2001) Career Development of Learning Technology Staff: Scoping Study, Report to JISC CALT.

Ben-David, J. (1977) *Centres of Learning – Britain, France, Germany, United States.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Benjamin, J. (2000) The Scholarship of Teaching in Teams: what does it look like in practice?, *Higher Education Research and Development*, Vol.19, No.2: 191-204.

Berman Brown, R., and McCartney, S (1998) The link between research and teaching: its purpose and implications, *Innovations in Education and Training International*, Vol. 35, No.1: 117-29.

Berrell, M. M. (1998) The Place of Research, Scholarship and Teaching in Newly Established Universities, *Higher Education Management*, Vol.10, No.2: 77-93.

Boyer, E. L. (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered: priorities of the profesorate.* New Jersey: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer, E.L. (1994) Scholarship Reconsidered: priorities for a new century, *Universities in the Twenty-First Century*. Washington, D.C.: The National Commission on Education, 110-131.

Brew, A. and Boud, D. (1995a) Research and Learning in Higher Education in Smith, B. and Brown, S. (eds) *Research, Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, London: Kogan Page: 30-39.

Brew, A. and Boud, D. (1995b) Teaching and Research: establishing the vital link with learning, *Higher Education*, Vol. 29, No 3: 261-273.

Brown, R. (2000a) Funding and Policy Drivers, *The Relationship between Research and Teaching in Higher Education: Present Realities, Future Possibilities.* Southampton Institute and the Higher Education Funding Council for England, 65-69.

Brown, R. (2000b) Teaching is the Main Event, Not a Sideshow to Research, *Research Fortnight*, 12 January: 17.

Brown, S.C. (1997) Redefining Scholarly Work, *Educational Forum*, Vol 62, No.1: 40-46.

Cambridge, B. (no date) Fostering the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: communities of practice, Washington, D.C.: *American Association of Higher Education.*

Cambridge, B (1999) The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: questions and answers from the field. *AAHE Bulletin*, Vol 52, No 4: 7-10.

Carnegie Foundation the Advancement of Teaching, (2000) Informational Program Booklet, Menlo Park: California: The Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.

Coate, K., Barnett, R. and Williams, G. (2001) Relationships between Teaching and Research in Higher Education, *Higher Education Quarterly*, Vol. 55, No. 2: 158-174.

Colbeck, Carol, L. (1998) Merging in a Seamless Blend: how faculty integrate teaching and research, *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 69, No.6: 647-671.

Cooke, R. (1998) Enhancing Teaching Quality, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, Vol.22, No 3: 283-284.

Cunsolo, J., Elrick, M., Middleton, A. and Roy, D (1996) The Scholarship of Teaching: A Canadian Perspective with Examples, *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 26, No. 1: 35-56.

Daly, William, T. (1994) Teaching and Scholarship: adapting American Higher Education to Hard Times, *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 65, No.1: 45-55.

D'Andrea, V. and Gosling, D. (2000) Promoting Research in Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: two case studies of multi-disciplinary pedagogic research, *ESRC Teaching and Learning Research Programme*, Leicester, UK, October.

D'Andrea, V. and Gosling, D. (2001) Joining the Dots: reconceptualising educational development', *Active Learning*, Vol. 2, No. 1: 65-81.

Elton, L. and Partington, P. (1991) *Teaching Standards and Excellence in Higher Education: Developing a Culture for Quality* USDTU/CVCP Green Paper No.1.

Elton, L. (1992) Research, Teaching and Scholarship in an Expanding Higher Education System, *Higher Education Quarterly*, Vol. 46, No.3, 252-268.

Elton, L. (1999) Research and Teaching: what are the real relationships?, London: Higher Education Research and Development Unit, University College London.

Elton, L. (2000) Research and Teaching: Possible Future Contexts and Considerations, *The Relationship between Research and Teaching in Higher Education: Present Realities, Future Possibilities.* Southampton Institute and the Higher Education Funding Council for England, 37-43.

Elton, L. (2001) Research and Teaching: conditions for a positive link, *Teaching in Higher Education*, Vol. 6, No.1, 43-56.

Entwistle, N. (1998) Priorities in research into learning and teaching in higher education, *Research Seminar, Report of the CVCP/SRHE.*

Entwistle, N. (2000) *Promoting deep learning through teaching and assessment: conceptual frameworks and educational contexts*, ESRC Teaching and Learning Programme, Conference 2000, Leicester

Gardiner, V. (1993) Teaching, Learning and Research - on the separation of the indivisible, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, Vol. 17, No.2, 180-186.

Gibbs, G. (1992) *Improving the Quality of Student Learning.* Bristol: Technical & Educational Services.

Gibbs, G. (1995) The Relationship Between Quality in Research and Quality in Teaching, *Quality in Higher Education*, Vol.1, No.2,147-157.

Gibbs, G. (1999) *Institutional Learning and Teaching Strategies: A guide to good practice* HEFCE 99/55.

Gibbs, G. (2000) Ways of integrating the scholarship of teaching in institutional strategy. Presentation at ILT Symposium on the Scholarship of Teaching.

Glassick, C.E., Huber, M.T. and Maerof, G.I. (1997) *Scholarship Assessed: evaluation of the professorate.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Gordon, G. (2000a) Applying the concept of the Entrepreneurial University to the

development institutional strategies for encouraging innovation and creativity in teaching and learning. SRHE Conference, Stirling, June 2000.

Gordon, G. (2000b) The national promotion of the scholarship of learning and teaching. Presentation at ILT Symposium on the Scholarship of Teaching.

Gosling, D. and D'Andrea, V. (2000) Research and Teaching: revaluing pedagogic research in higher education, *Society for Research in Higher Education 2000 Conference*, Leicester, December.

Gosling, D and D'Andrea, V. (2001) ILT web-pages

Gravestock, P. and Healey, M. (eds.) (1998) Review of the Guides to Good Teaching, Learning and Assessment Practices in Geography, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, Vol.99, Nos. 3/4.

Habermas, J. (1971) *Knowledge and Human Interests*, Boston: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1984) *The Theory of Communicative Action*, Vol 1, (Trans) T. McCarthy. London: Heineman.

Hativa, N. and Marincovich, M. (Eds) (1995) *Disciplinary Differences in Teaching and Learning: Implications for Practice*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hattie, J. and Marsh, H.M. (1996) The Relationship Between Research and Teaching: A Meta-Analysis, *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 66, No.4: 507-542.

Healey, M. (2000a) Developing the Scholarship of Teaching in Higher Education: a discipline-based approach, *Higher Education Research & Development*, Vol. 19, No.2:168-189.

Healey, M. (2000b) How to put scholarship into teaching, *Times Higher Educational Supplement*, 4 February.

Healey, M. (2000c) Promoting lifelong professional development in geographical education: developing the scholarship of teaching in higher education in the 21st Century, International Geographical Congress, Seoul, Korea.

Healey, M. (2000d) The Scholarship of Teaching in Higher Education: An Evolving Idea. Presentation at ILT Symposium on the Scholarship of Teaching.

Heap, H. P. S., 1999, Making British Universities Accountable: in the public interest?, Conference: *Towards a New Economics of Science*, University of Notre Dame, Chicago.

HEFCE (2000a) *Review of Research, Report 00/37*, Bristol, Higher Education Funding Council for England.

HEFCE (2000b) *Rewarding and Developing Staff in Higher Education 00/56*, Bristol, Higher Education Funding Council for England.

HEFCE (2001) *Review of Research: Report on Consultation 01/17*, Bristol, Higher Education Funding Council for England.

Henkel, M. (2000) *Academic Identities and Policy Change in Higher Education* London: Jessica Kingsley.

Huber, M.T. (1999) Developing Discourse Communities Around the Scholarship of Teaching, *Campus Colloquium on Campus Conversations*, Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education.

Hutchings, P. (ed) (2000) *Opening Lines: approaches to the scholarship of teaching and learning.* Palo Alto, CA: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Hutchings, P. and Shulman, L. (1999) The Scholarship of Teaching: new elaborations, new developments, *Change*, Vol. 31, No 5: 11-15.

Jamieson, J. et al (2000) Place and Space in the Design of New Learning Environments, *Higher Education Research & Development*, Vol. 19, No.2

Jenkins, A. (2000a) Summary/Review of the Research and Scholarly Evidence on Teaching/Research Relationships in Higher Education, *The Relationship between Research and Teaching in Higher Education: Present Realities, Future Possibilities*, Southampton Institute and the Higher Education Funding Council for England, 23-32.

Jenkins, A. (2000b) The Relationship between Teaching and Research: where does geography stand and deliver?, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, Vol. 24, No.3: 325-351.

Jenkins, A. (2000) The relationship between teaching and research: Where does geography stand and deliver?, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, Vol. 24, No. 3: 325-351.

Jenkins, A. et al. (1998) Teaching and Research: Student Perceptions and Policy Implications, *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 23, No 2,127-141.

Jenkins, A. (1997) Twenty-one volumes on: Is teaching valued in geography in higher education? *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, Vol. 21, No. 1: 5-14.

Jenkins, A. (1996) Discipline-based educational development. *International Journal for Academic Development*, Vol. 1, No. 1: 50-62.

Johnston, R. J. (1996) And Now its All Over, Was it Worth All the Effort, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, Vol. 20, No. 2: 159-165.

Kreber, C. (2000) How University Teaching Award Winners Conceptualise Academic Work: some further thoughts on the meaning of scholarship, *Teaching in Higher Education,*Vol. 5, No.1: 61-78.

Kreber, C. (1999) A Course-based Approach to the Development of Teaching-scholarship: a case study. *Teaching in Higher Education*, Vol. 4, No. 3: 309-326.

Kreber, C. and Cranton, P.A. (2000) Exploring the Scholarship of Teaching, The *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol.71, No.4: 466-495.

MacDonald, R. (2000) The Scholarship of Teaching: An Institutional Case Study. Presentation at ILT Symposium on the Scholarship of Teaching.

McWilliam, E., Green, A., Hunt, N., Bridgstock, M. and Young, B. (2000) Inviting Conversations? Dialogic Difficulties in the Corporate University, *Higher Education Research & Development*, Vol.19, No.2:.237-252.

Malcolm, J. and Zukas, M. (2000) Becoming an Educator: Communities of Practice in Higher Education, in McNay, I. (Ed) *Higher Education and its Communities* Buckingham: SRHE/OUP pp51-64.

Marsden, G. (2000) Publish or Perish, *Prospect*, January: 11.

Marsh, H. and Hattie J. (2000) The Relationship between Research Productivity and Teaching Effectiveness: Complimentary, Antagonistic, or Independent Constructs?

Martin, E. et al. (1998) Communicating the Scholarship of Teaching, *Developing Scholarship in Teaching*,[On-line]. Available: http://www.creativecpmtomgencies/joanb/

Martin, E., and Ramsden, P. (2000) Introduction, *Higher Education Research & Development*, Vol.19, No.2:.133-135.

Marton, F. & Booth, S. (1997) *Learning and Awareness.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaurn Associates.

Marton, F., Hounsell, D.J. and Entwistle, N.J. eds (1997) *The Experience of Learning.* (2nd ed) Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press

McNay, I. (1999) The Paradoxes of Research Assessment and Funding, in M.H. and B. Little (eds) *Changing Relationships between Higher Education and the State.* London: Jessica Kingsley,191-203.

Mc William, E. (2000) Inviting Conversations? Dialogic Difficulties in the Corporate University, *Higher Education Research & Development*, Vol. 19, No.2

Mezirow, J. (1991) *Transformative dimensions of adult learning,* San Francisco, Jossey-Bass

Millar, F. (1991) Scholarship, Research and Teaching in the Context of Academic Autonomy, *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 16, No.1: 3-28.

Moses, I. (1990) 'Teaching, research and scholarship in different disciplines', *Higher Education*, Vol 19, No. 3: 351-275

Neumann, R. (1992) Perceptions of the Teaching-Research Link: a framework for analysis, *Higher Education*, Vol 23, No. 2: 159-171.

O'Reilly, D., Weaver, N and Caddick, M. (2000) Disciplining Interdisciplinarity: pedagogic tensions within architectural education, in Rust, C. (ed) *Improving Student Learning: improving student learning through the disciplines*, Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development, 294-303.

Paulsen, M.B. and Feldman, K.A. (1995) Toward a Reconceptualization of Scholarship, *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 66, No. 6: 615-640.

Ramsden, P. and I. Moses (1992) Association Between Research and Teaching in Australian Higher Education, *Higher Education*, Vol 23, No. 3: 273-295.

Reeders, E (2000) Scholarly Practice in Work-based Learning: Fitting the glass slipper, *Higher Education Research & Development*, Vol. 19, No.2: 205-220.

Rice, R.E. (1992) Toward a Broader Conception of Scholarship: The American Context, in Whiston, T.G. and Geiger, R.L., *Research and Higher Education: The United Kingdom and the United States*, Buckingham: Open University Press, 117-129

Richlin, L. (2001) Scholarly Teaching and the Scholarship of Teaching, *New Directions in Teaching and Learning* Jossey-Bass Publishers

Robertson, J. (1999) What do Academics Value? experiences of the relation between teaching and research, Canterbury: Educational Research and Advisory Unit, University of Canterbury.

Rowland, S. (1996) Relationships Between Teaching and Research, *Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, Vol 1, No 1, 7-20.

Rowland, S. (2000) The Enquiring University Teacher, Buckingham: SRHE & Open University Press.

Scott, P. (1991) 'Beyond the Dual-support System: scholarship, research and teaching in the context of academic autonomy', *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 16, No.1: 5-13.

Shulman, L. S. (1999) Taking Learning Seriously, *Change*, July/August, 11-17.

Shulman, L. (1993) Teaching as Community Property, *Change*, Vol. 25, No.6: 6-7.

Stenhouse, L. (1980) Reflections in Stenhouse, L. (ed) *Curriculum Research and Development in Action*, London: Heinemann Educational Books, 244-262.

Trigwell, K., et al (2000) 'Scholarship of Teaching: a model' *Higher Education Research & Development*, Vol. 19, No.2: 156-168.

Weimer, M. (1993) The Disciplinary Journals on Pedagogy, *Change*, November/December, 44-51.

Westergaard, J. (1991) 'Scholarship, Research and Teaching: a view from the social sciences', *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 16, No.1: 23-28.

Williams, D.N. (1991) The Role of Scholarship in the Community College ERIC Digests, ED 338294.

Williams, R.J.P. (1991) 'Science in Universities: teaching, research and autonomy', *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 16, No.1: 15 21.

Willis, D., Harper, J. and Sawicka, T. (1999) Putting the worms back in the can: encouraging diversity in the teaching research nexus, HERDSA Conference, Melbourne:University of Wellington, July.

Woodhouse, D. (1998) Auditing Research and the Research/Teaching Nexus, New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. 33, No.1:

Yorke, M. (1999) Pedagogical Research in UK Higher Education, *Pedagogical Research Group.*

Yorke, M. (2000) A Cloistered Virtue? pedagogical research and policy in UK higher education, *Higher Education Quarterly*, Vol. 54, No. 2: 106-126.

Zukas M, and Malcolm, J. (2000) 'Pedagogies for Lifelong Learning: Building Bridges or Building Walls, *Supporting Lifelong Learning, Working Papers*, University of East London

Appendix 2

List of abbreviations

ALT	Association for Learning Technology
AUT	Association of University Teachers
C&IT	Communications and information technology
CASTL	Carnegie Academy for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning
CPD	Continuing professional development
DfES	Department for Education and Skills
ESRC	Economic and Social Research Council
FDTL	Fund for the Development of Teaching and Learning
HEDG	Heads of Educational Development Group
HEFCE	Higher Education Funding Council for England
HEFCW	Higher Education Funding Council for Wales
HESDA	Higher Education Staff Development Agency
ILT	Institute for Learning and Teaching
JISC	Joint Information Systems Committee
LTSN	Learning and Teaching Support Network
NATFHE	National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education
NCT	National Co-ordination Team
NTFS	National Teaching Fellowship Scheme
NTF	National Teaching Fellow
PedD	Pedagogical development
PedR	Pedagogical research
QAA	Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education
RAE	Research Assessment Exercise
SCOP	Standing Conference of Principals
SEDA	Staff and Educational Development Association
SHEFC	Scottish Higher Education Funding Council
SKILL	National Bureau for Students with Disabilities
SRHE	Society for Research into Higher Education
THETO	The Higher Education Training Organisation
TLRP	Teaching and Learning Research Programme
TLTP	Teaching and Learning Technology Programme
TQEF	Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund
UUK	Universities UK

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").